Calendar No. 948

98TH CONGRESS, 2d Session } SENATE { REPORT No. 98-502

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1985

JUNE 5, 1984.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. HATFIELD, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 5653]

The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 5653) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, and for other purposes, reports the same to the Senate with various amendments and presents herewith information relative to the changes recommended:

AMOUNT IN NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY, FISCAL YEAR 1985

Amount of bill as passed by the House	$15,470,725,000
Budget estimates considered by House	15,874,791,000
Budget estimates considered by Senate	15,874,791,000
Amount of bill as reported to the Senate	15,371,133,000
The bill as reported to the Senate—	
Under the budget estimate, 1985	−503,658,000
Under the House-passed bill	−99,592,000

32-250 O

S183-2

CONTENTS TO REPORT

TITLE I

Department of Defense—Civil: Department of the Army:
Corps of Engineers—Civil: Page
Construction, general 25
Flood control and coastal emergencies 41
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries 42
General expenses 69
General investigations 7
Operation and maintenance, general 48

TITLE II

Department of the Interior:
Bureau of Reclamation:
Construction program 77
General administrative expenses 95
General investigations 70
Loan program 91
Operation and maintenance 91

TITLE III

Department of Energy:
Atomic energy defense activities 163
Departmental administration 199
Energy supply, research and development activities 96
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission 213
General science and research activities 155
Geothermal Resources Development Fund 218
Nuclear waste disposal fund 163
Power marketing administrations:
Alaska Power Administration 208
Bonneville Power Administration 208
Southeastern Power Administration 211
Southwestern Power Administration 211
Western Area Power Administration 212
Uranium supply and enrichment activities 145

TITLE IV

Independent Agencies:
Appalachian Regional Commission 219
Delaware River Basin Commission 221
Funds Appropriated to the President 219
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin 222
Nuclear Regulatory Commission 222
Susquehanna River Basin Commission 223
Tennessee Valley Authority 224

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to provide appropriations for the fiscal year 1985 beginning October 1, 1984 and ending September 30, 1985 for energy and water development, and for other related purposes. It supplies funds for water resources development programs and related activities of the Department of the Army, Civil Functions—U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Civil Works program in title I; for the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation in title II; for the Department of Energy (except for fossil fuel programs, and certain conservation and regulatory programs) in title III; and for related independent agencies and commissions, including the Appalachian Regional Commission and Appalachian Regional Development Programs, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the Tennessee Valley Authority in title IV.

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The fiscal year 1985 budget estimates for this bill totals $15,874,791,000 in new budget (obligational) authority. The recommendation of the Committee totals $15,371,133,000. This is a decrease of $503,658,000 below the budget estimates and $99,592,000 below the House bill.

The President has submitted a proposal for a deficit reduction package which makes changes in domestic programs, revenues, and defense activities. The elements of the reduction plan are contingent upon meeting certain other requirements and conditions. The reductions proposed for defense activities, other than Department of Defense programs, amount to $500,000,000. Defense programs within the Department of Energy are allocated a reduction under the package of at least $400,000,000. Although the final disposition of the package is unclear, the Committee recommendation is fully consistent with earlier Senate action on the deficit reduction plan.

BILL HIGHLIGHTS

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

The amount recommended in the bill includes $7,324,051,000 for atomic energy defense activities. Major programs and activities include:

Testing	$620,390,000
Research and development	1,044,085,000
Weapons activities	4,221,430,000
Nuclear materials production	1,711,100,000
Defense waste management	752,771,000

ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT

The bill recommended by the Committee provides a total of $1,986,168,000 for energy supply, research, development and demonstration programs including:

Solar energy	$183,049,000
Geothermal energy	31,087,000
Nuclear fission	626,003,000
Magnetic fusion	470,138,000
Environmental	196,116,000
Basic energy sciences	411,830,000

GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH

The Committee recommendation also provides a net appropriation of $726,905,000 for general science and research activities in life sciences, high energy physics and nuclear physics. Major programs are:

High energy physics research	$547,800,000
Nuclear physics	180,600,000

REGULATORY AND OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Also recommended in the bill is $788,885,000 for various regulatory and independent agencies of the Federal Government. Major programs and activities include:

Appalachian regional development programs	$119,700,000
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	95,677,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	458,200,000
Tennessee Valley Authority	115,308,000

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

The Committee has also recommended appropriations totaling approximately $3,842,806,000 for Federal water resource development programs. This includes projects and related activities of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Tennessee Valley Authority. The Federal water resource development program provides lasting benefits to the Nation in the areas of flood control, municipal and industrial water supply, irrigation of agricultural lands, water conservation, commercial navigation, hydroelectric power, recreation, and fish and wildlife enhancement.

Major programs related to water resources development include:

Corps of Engineers—Civil:	
General investigations	$125,639,000
Construction activities	1,101,650,000
Operations and maintenance activities	1,417,736,000
Bureau of Reclamation:	
General investigations	31,023,000
Construction activities	752,397,000
Operations and maintenance activities	149,689,000
Tennessee Valley Authority:	
Construction activities	14,619,000
Operating expenses	6,765,000

WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Water is this Nation's most precious and valuable resource—the basic need of all life. Therefore, it is clear that the adequate supply of water is as important, if not more important, than energy to the Nation.

Except in times of crisis, water in America is too often taken for granted. Water resources needs and solutions are unique from region to region. One region can be experiencing droughts and another suffering from severe flooding. We complacently turn on the tap and water magically flows from it.

Yet, the protection of life and property and the assurance of adequate supplies of water for domestic or productive uses come from a vast infrastructure system which for the most part remains out-of-sight and out-of-mind.

Our water resources infrastructure forms a vital part of our Nation's transportation system, its economy, and indeed, its well-being. Yet, this system is in critical need of repair, rehabilitation, and improvement. On the inland waterways, many canals, locks, and dams are past the end of their design lives. Of the 194 locks in the inland waterway system, the average age is 40 years, and some locks are approaching 80 years of service.

The water supply systems throughout the country are critically in need of extensive repair, rehabilitation, and improvement. Problems exist with extensive leakage, inadequate water treatment facilities, and the need for new sources of water supply.

NEED FOR WATER RESOURCE LEGISLATION

The last water resources development authorization bill was signed into law in 1976. The last true construction authorization bill was signed into law in 1970. The 1974 and 1976 acts consisted primarily of authorizations for advanced engineering and design of projects rather than for construction. As a result, over this 14-year period, a very large backlog of proposed water resources projects has accumulated. Detailed testimony has been received annually on how critical it has become to address the water resource needs of the country that have been ignored for over a decade.

Addressing this backlog of work is a major undertaking that will take many years to complete. The Committee, therefore, believes that it is in the best interest of the Nation to proceed, as soon as possible, and expedite the authorization process so that resultant benefits can be realized.

The time has come for Congress to act on the important issue of Federal water resource development investments, and the Committee pledges its support for enactment of an omnibus authorization bill. However, if, in September 1984, there is no omnibus authorization bill enacted or the likelihood of enactment is not good, the Committee expects to present high priority water resource projects for consideration.

Pending enactment of authorizing legislation, the Committee directs that no upfront financing or cost sharing on reconnaissance phase studies, continuation of planning and engineering, advanced or preconstruction planning, and construction be implemented.

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development of the Committee on Appropriations held 17 sessions of hearings (13 different days) in connection with the fiscal year 1985 appropriation bill. The Committee received testimony from the executive branch, numerous Members of the House and Senate, several Governors, other State and local elected officials, and private citizens. The recommendations for 1985 have, therefore, been developed after careful consideration of available data.

VOTES IN THE COMMITTEE

The subcommittee, by unanimous vote of a quorum present, on May 24, 1984, recommended that the bill, as amended, be reported to the full Committee on Appropriations.

The Committee, by unanimous vote of a quorum present on June 5, 1984, recommended that the bill, as amended, be reported.

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7, RULE XVI, STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

The following items of appropriations recommended by the Committee, not made to carry out the provisions of existing law or an act passed by the Senate in this session, are brought to the attention of the Senate in accordance with rule XVI, paragraph 7.

On page 14, under construction program, an amendment is included providing appropriations for the Twin Falls Canal Co., for which there is no authorization.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 1984	$133,810,000
Budget estimate, 1985	118,000,000
House allowance	151,851,000
Committee recommendation	125,639,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+7,639,000
House allowance	−26,212,000

An appropriation of $125,639,000 is recommended by the Committee, which is $26,212,000 below the House allowance and $8,171,000 below the current level of funding.

The recommended amounts provided under this heading for surveys and planning activities are shown in the following table, with Committee comments following immediately after the tabulation.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	ALABAMA								
(M)	ALABAMA-COOSA RIVER BELOW CLAIBORNE L&D	2,052,000	699,000	250,000	—	250,000	—	250,000	—
(M)	BAYOU LA BATRE	207,000	80,000	—	—	75,000	—	—	—
(M)	MOBILE HARBOR (DEEPENING) (CP&E)	4,850,000	2,316,000	1,000,000	—	1,800,000	—	1,000,000	—
(FC)	THREEMILE CREEK, MOBILE (CP&E)	950,000	575,000	260,000	—	260,000	—	260,000	—
(FC)	VILLAGE CREEK, JEFFERSON COUNTY (CP&E)	505,000	215,000	115,000	—	115,000	—	115,000	—
(M)	WILLIAM BACON OLIVER LOCK AND DAM (CP&E)	4,080,000	300,000	—	—	2,850,000	—	1,500,000	—
	ALASKA								
(FC)	BETHEL BANK STABILIZATION (CP&E)	350,000	100,000	250,000	—	250,000	—	250,000	—
(FDP)	GALENA BANK STABILIZATION	300,000	120,000	90,000	—	90,000	—	90,000	—
(FDP)	RIVERS AND HARBORS	9,630,000	2,191,000	845,000	—	845,000	—	845,000	—
(FDP)	SMALL HYDROPOWER	4,670,000	3,750,000	621,000	—	621,000	—	621,000	—
(M)	SOUTHCENTRAL DEEP-DRAFT NAVIGATION	1,972,000	1,401,000	196,000	—	196,000	—	196,000	—
	ARIZONA								
(FDP)	GILA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, AZ & NM	4,560,000	3,433,000	200,000	—	400,000	—	400,000	—
(FC)	HOLBROOK, LITTLE COLORADO RIVER (CP&E)	680,000	625,000	55,000	—	155,000	—	55,000	—
(FDP)	NOGALES WASH - GILA RIVER	500,000	200,000	150,000	—	150,000	—	150,000	—
(FDP)	PHOENIX METROPOLITAN AREA	3,785,000	3,712,000	—	—	200,000	—	—	—
	ARKANSAS								
(COMP)	ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN	2,100,000	310,000	—	—	—	—	100,000	—
(FDP)	CLARKSVILLE	1,000,000	338,000	50,000	—	50,000	—	50,000	—
(FC)	FOURCHE BAYOU IN THE VICINTY OF LITTLE ROCK (CP&E)	2,000,000	686,000	700,000	—	700,000	—	700,000	—
(FDP)	OUACHITA RIVER BASIN, AR & LA	7,960,000	6,436,000	715,000	—	715,000	—	715,000	—

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
(COMP)	RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAM, AR, LA, OK, & TX (AUTH RPTS)	1,899,000	1,428,000	335,000	---	335,000	---	335,000	---
(COMP)	RED RIV BASIN, AR, TX, LA & OK	1,510,000	470,000	200,000	---	520,000	---	200,000	---
(COMP)	WHITE RIVER BASIN AUTHORIZATION REPORT AR AND MO	880,000	400,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
	CALIFORNIA								
(FDP)	ANTELOPE VALLEY	985,000	645,000	140,000	---	140,000	---	140,000	---
(FC)	CACHE CREEK BASIN (CP&E)	2,000,000	320,000	450,000	---	450,000	---	450,000	---
(FDP)	CALLEGUAS CREEK	1,775,000	1,235,000	320,000	---	320,000	---	320,000	---
(SPEC)	COAST OF CALIFORNIA, STORMS AND TIDAL WAVES	7,410,000	1,920,000	700,000	---	700,000	---	700,000	---
(FC)	COTTONWOOD CREEK	20,900,000	15,875,000	---	2,500,000	---	2,500,000	---	2,500,000
(FC)	GOLETA AND VICINITY	2,850,000	1,240,000	---	325,000	---	325,000	---	325,000
(FDP)	GUADALUPE RIVER	2,261,000	2,114,250	---	---	145,000	---	---	---
(M)	LOS ANGELES AND LONG BEACH HARBORS (CP&E)	1,000,000	---	---	---	500,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA REVIEW	4,400,000	3,066,000	450,000	---	450,000	---	450,000	---
(FDP)	MORRISON CREEK STREAM GROUP (PHASE I)	3,000,000	2,500,000	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
(FDP)	NORTHERN CA STREAMS (DRY CREEK INTERIM)	750,000	300,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(M)	OCEANSIDE HARBOR	780,000	680,000	---	---	50,000	---	---	---
(FC)	REDBANK AND FANCHER CREEKS (CP&E)	3,800,000	2,250,000	900,000	---	900,300	---	900,000	---
(M)	REDONDO BEACH HARBOR	700,000	123,660	---	---	240,000	---	---	---
(M)	RICHMOND HARBOR (DEEPENING) (CP&E)	600,000	---	---	---	200,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY	945,000	555,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN	5,550,000	4,874,000	445,000	---	445,000	---	445,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN CALIENTE CREEK	1,550,000	---	---	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY SHORELINE	3,555,000	1,735,000	420,000	---	620,000	---	420,000	---
(M)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA (IN-DEPTH)	826,000	373,000	147,000	---	147,000	---	147,000	---
(FDP)	SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN & ORANGE COUNTY	9,340,000	6,689,000	300,000	---	700,000	---	300,000	---
(SP)	SANTA BARBARA COUNTY	219,000	---	---	---	150,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	SANTA BARBARA COUNTY STREAMS	1,376,000	1,134,000	242,000	---	242,000	---	242,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER (PHASE I) (CP&E)	20,300,000	5,725,000	2,500,000	---	3,500,000	---	2,500,000	---
(N)	SUNSET HARBOR	800,000	645,740	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
(N)	VENTURA MARINA	250,000	---	---	---	250,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	WALNUT CREEK BASIN	1,059,000	100,000	---	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	COLORADO								
(FDP)	ARKANSAS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES ABOVE JOHN MARTIN DAM (PHASE I)	5,125,000	2,739,000	206,000	---	206,000	---	206,000	---
(FDP)	FOUNTAIN CREEK AND TRIBS - NORTH OF PUEBLO	645,000	200,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
	CONNECTICUT								
(COMP)	LONG ISLAND SOUND-THAMESVILLE TIDAL FLOODING STUDY	435,000	135,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(SPEC)	LONG ISLAND SOUND - DREDGED MATERIAL CONTAINMENT STUDY	1,855,000	1,789,000	66,000	---	66,000	---	66,000	---
	FLORIDA								
(N)	BISCAYNE BAY	1,605,000	180,000	---	---	425,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	BREVARD COUNTY	405,000	203,000	---	---	35,000	---	---	---
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR	50,000	---	---	---	50,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	CENTRAL & SOUTHERN FLORIDA WATER SUPPLY	2,292,000	2,152,000	140,000	---	140,000	---	140,000	---
(N)	CLEARWATER SPOIL DISPOSAL	60,000	---	---	---	60,000	---	---	---
(N)	ESCAMBIA RIVER	285,000	110,000	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	FLORIDA COMPREHENSIVE COASTLINE STUDY	250,000	---	---	---	250,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	FT. PIERCE HARBOR (CP&E)	200,000	---	---	---	125,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	GOLDEN GATE ESTATES	1,289,000	880,000	---	---	402,000	---	300,000	---
(N)	GULF COAST PASSES (CP&E)	250,000	---	---	---	200,000	---	---	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, MILL COVE (CP&E)	200,000	50,000	---	---	150,000	---	---	---
(N)	JUPITER INLET	50,000	---	---	---	50,000	---	---	---
(BE)	LEE COUNTY, CAPTIVA ISLAND	1,000,000	---	---	---	---	150,000	---	---
(N)	MEXICO BEACH INLET	265,000	132,345	---	---	133,000	---	---	---
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL	737,000	371,000	---	---	200,000	---	---	---
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR	183,000	---	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
(BE)	MONROE COUNTY (CP&E)	218,000	50,000	---	---	168,000	---	---	---
(BE)	PANAMA CITY BEACHES (CP&E)	2,860,000	400,000	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(N)	PORT SUTTON CHANNEL	293,000	170,000	123,000	---	123,000	---	123,000	---
(BE)	SARASOTA COUNTY (CP&E)	467,000	---	---	---	200,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	SIX MILE CYPRESS CREEK	403,000	109,000	---	---	---	---	194,000	---
(FDP)	ST. MARY'S RIVER BASIN, FL & GA	1,125,000	200,000	---	---	300,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	SUWANEE RIVER	1,650,000	570,000	---	---	500,000	---	200,000	---
(SPEC)	TAMPA BAY BIOLOGICAL & WATER QUALITY STUDY	100,000	---	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	TAMPA BAY HURRICANE EVACUATION	100,000	---	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
(N)	TAMPA HARBOR, BRANCH CHANNELS	1,340,000	100,000	---	460,000	---	460,000	---	460,000
	GEORGIA								
(N)	APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE, FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL & FL	2,302,000	974,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	BRUNSWICK AREA	970,000	625,000	---	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	DALTON LAKE (PHASE I)	2,392,000	671,000	700,000	---	700,000	---	600,000	---
(MP)	LAKE LANIER REREGULATION, METRO ATLANTA (CP&E)	1,900,000	623,000	700,000	---	700,000	---	600,000	---
(FDP)	NORTHEAST GEORGIA REGION	1,360,000	712,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FC)	SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN AT OATES CREEK (CP&E)	695,000	175,000	325,000	---	325,000	---	325,000	---
(FDP)	SOUTH METROPOLITAN ATLANTA REGION	839,000	250,000	1[illegible],000	---	130,000	---	330,000	---
	GUAM								
(FC)	AGANA RIVER (CP&E)	430,000	150,000	280,000	---	280,000	---	280,000	---
(N)	HARBORS & RIVERS IN THE TERRITORY OF GUAM	3,450,000	2,892,000	180,000	---	180,000	---	180,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	HAWAII								
(FDP)	HARBORS & RIVERS IN HAWAII	3,634,000	3,254,000	235,000	---	235,000	---	235,000	---
(FDP)	HARBORS & RIVERS IN HAWAII, HI-SO. KOHALA WATER SUPPLY INTERIM	663,000	300,000	65,000	---	65,000	---	65,000	---
	IDAHO								
(FDP)	COLUMBIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ID, MT, OR, & WA	24,016,000	13,937,000	1,649,000	---	1,649,000	---	1,649,000	---
(FDP)	UPPER SNAKE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (PARENT)	8,039,000	4,531,000	457,000	---	457,000	---	457,000	---
	ILLINOIS								
(FDP)	ALEXANDER AND PULASKI COUNTIES	1,300,000	263,000	350,000	---	350,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	CHICAGO-SOUTH END OF LAKE MICHIGAN, IL & IN	5,133,000	3,498,000	230,000	---	230,000	---	230,000	---
(FDP)	CHICAGOLAND UNDERFLOW PLAN (PHASE I)	9,119,000	8,232,000	810,000	---	810,000	---	810,000	---
(FDP)	ILLINOIS RIVER - HENRY TO NAPLES	625,000	375,000	---	---	250,000	---	---	---
(FC)	LOVES PARK (CP&E)	1,425,000	---	---	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	MACKINAW RIVER	525,000	205,000	125,000	---	125,000	---	125,000	---
(FDP)	MISS RVR COON RAPIDS	8,560,000	6,078,000	1,012,000	---	1,012,000	---	500,000	---
(FC)	NORTH BRANCH CHICAGO RIVER (CP&E)	780,000	150,000	---	---	300,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	QUINCY BAY	470,000	---	---	---	---	---	200,000	---
(FC)	SOUTH QUINCY (CP&E)	450,000	---	---	---	150,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	VERMILION RIVER	470,000	210,000	110,000	---	110,000	---	110,000	---
	INDIANA								
(FDP)	FORT WAYNE METROPOLITAN AREA	550,000	80,000	225,000	---	225,000	---	225,000	---
(COMP)	WABASH RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE (AUTHORIZATION REPORTS), IN & IL	2,967,000	1,752,000	295,000	---	295,000	---	295,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	IOWA								
(FC)	PERRY CREEK (CP&E)	515,000	200,000	185,000	---	185,000	---	185,000	---
	KANSAS								
(FDP)	ARK &IV AND TRIBS GREAT BEND KS TO TULSA OK	7,180,000	4,580,000	183,000	---	183,000	---	183,000	---
(FC)	DOUGLASS LAKE	82,200,000	65,000	---	---	---	200,000	---	---
(FC)	GREAT BEND	1,560,000	1,154,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
(FDP)	KANSAS AND OSAGE RIVERS	5,730,000	5,142,000	318,000	---	318,000	---	318,000	---
(FDP)	VERDIGRIS RIVER KS AND OK	3,700,000	3,485,000	80,000	---	80,000	---	80,000	---
(FDP)	VERDIGRIS RIVER KS AND OK, CANEY RIVER	465,000	100,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FC)	VERDIGRIS RIVER, KANSAS AND OKLAHOMA, MINGO CREEK (CP&E)	1,300,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---	---	---
	KENTUCKY								
(N)	CUMBERLAND-TENNESSEE RIVERS, KY, AL, GA, MS, NC, TN, & VA	6,485,000	1,887,000	655,000	---	655,000	---	655,000	---
(FC)	FALMOUTH LAKE	76,500,000	---	---	---	---	300,000	---	---
(FC)	FRANKFORT (SOUTH FRANKFORT)	5,200,000	562,000	---	---	---	---	---	120,000
(FDP)	KENTUCKY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	2,322,000	1,822,000	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	TRADEWATER RIVER BASIN	200,000	---	---	---	50,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY & TN	2,921,000	1,281,350	---	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
	LOUISIANA								
(FDP)	ALOHA - RIGOLETTE AREA	830,000	845,000	---	---	300,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	865,000	350,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA & TX SECTION	4,065,000	1,998,000	395,000	---	395,000	---	395,000	---
(FDP)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN-WEST SHORE	967,000	90,000	120,000	---	120,000	---	120,000	---
(FDP)	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA	3,999,000	3,087,000	385,000	---	385,000	---	385,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
(FDP)	MERMENTAU, VERMILION, & CALCASIEU RVS & BAYOU TECHE...	5,300,000	1,913,000	540,000	---	540,000	---	540,000	---
(N)	MISS RIVER SHIP CHANNEL, GULF TO BATON ROUGE (CP&E)...	7,600,000	4,645,000	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, SHREVEPORT LA TO VICINITY OF INDEX AR.....	200,000,000	808,000	---	---	---	520,000	---	520,000
	MAINE								
(N)	FORE RIVER CHANNEL PORTLAND HARBOR.....	432,000	357,000	75,000	---	75,000	---	75,000	---
(FDP)	SAINT JOHN RIVER.....	3,760,000	1,743,000	430,000	---	430,000	---	430,000	---
	MARYLAND								
(SP)	CHESAPEAKE BAY SHORELINE EROSION, MD & VA.....	500,000	---	---	---	---	---	250,000	---
	MASSACHUSETTS								
(COMP)	CONN R. BASIN AUTH REPORTS, MA, CT, VT & NH.....	3,950,000	2,522,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FC)	ROUGHANS POINT, REVERE (CP&E).....	900,000	100,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(COMP)	S.E. NEW ENGLAND - AUTH. REPORTS, MA, RI, & CT.....	1,912,000	1,682,000	180,000	---	180,000	---	180,000	---
(FC)	TOWN BROOK, QUINCY (CP&E).....	600,000	500,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
	MICHIGAN								
(FDP)	GREAT LAKES, PARTIC LAKES ONTARIO & ERIE.....	9,959,000	8,885,000	530,000	---	530,000	---	530,000	---
(N)	GREAT LAKES CONNECTING CHANNELS AND HARBORS.....	6,750,000	5,711,000	1,039,000	---	1,039,000	---	1,039,000	---
(N)	MONROE HARBOR (CP&E).....	2,100,000	200,000	---	---	790,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	SAGINAW RIVER BASIN STUDY.....	3,685,000	802,000	225,000	---	225,000	---	225,000	---
	MINNESOTA								
(FC)	CHASKA.....	1,700,000	1,409,000	---	291,000	---	291,000	---	291,000
(FC)	EAST GRAND FORKS.....	1,700,000	858,000	---	255,000	---	255,000	---	255,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
(FC)	HOUSTON (ROOT RIVER) (CP&E)	738,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	MINNESOTA RIVER VALLEY	9,522,000	3,848,000	680,000	---	975,000	---	680,000	---
(FDP)	RED RIVER OF THE NORTH, MN & ND	8,685,000	6,681,000	1,079,000	---	1,079,000	---	1,079,000	---
(FC)	REDWOOD RIVER AT MARSHALL (CP&E)	310,000	150,000	160,000	---	160,000	---	160,000	---
(FC)	SOUTH FORK, ZUMBRO RIVER, ROCHESTER	51,400,000	2,480,000	---	---	---	400,000	100,000	---
(FDP)	ST CROIX RIVER MN & WI	1,127,000	647,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
	MISSISSIPPI								
(FDP)	MISSISSIPPI GULF COAST AREA	1,974,000	300,000	---	---	---	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	PASCAGOULA RIVER BASIN, MS & AL	2,143,000	1,831,000	312,000	---	312,000	---	312,000	---
(FDP)	PEARL RIVER BASIN, MS & LA	7,180,000	5,346,000	813,000	---	813,000	---	813,000	---
(SPEC)	TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY SPECIAL STUDY, MS, AL, TN & KY	6,083,000	5,971,000	112,000	---	112,000	---	112,000	---
(N)	YAZOO RIVER	9,000,000	2,035,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000
	MISSOURI								
(FC)	HANNIBAL	700,000	461,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000
(FC)	MALINE CREEK (CP&E)	3,200,000	---	---	---	500,000	---	---	---
(FC)	MERAMEC RIVER BASIN (FLOOD CONTROL)	20,000,000	1,400,000	---	---	---	750,000	---	400,000
(SPEC)	MERAMEC RIVER BASIC (WATER SUPPLY)	600,000	100,000	---	---	500,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	OSAGE RIVER BASIN, MO, ABOVE HARRY S TRUMAN DAM	1,100,000	400,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(N)	ST LOUIS HARBOR, MO & IL (CP&E)	2,300,000	2,260,000	---	---	600,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	ST LOUIS METRO AREA, MO & IL	11,150,000	8,618,000	1,170,000	---	1,170,000	---	1,170,000	---
(FDP)	WEARS CREEK, JEFFERSON CITY (PHASE I)	260,000	150,000	110,000	---	110,000	---	110,000	---
(FDP)	WHITE RIVER BASIN COUNTY LINE LAKE	1,050,000	930,000	120,000	---	120,000	---	120,000	---
	NEBRASKA								
(FDP)	REPUBLICAN RIVER, NE & KS	---	---	---	---	200,000	---	200,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	NEVADA								
(FDP)	LAS VEGAS WASH & TRIBUTARIES	1,125,000	450,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	VIRGIN RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (MOAPA VALLEY)	1,000,000	400,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
	NEW JERSEY								
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER COMPREHENSIVE NAVIGATION STUDY, PA, NJ, & DE	6,334,000	2,771,000	610,000	---	610,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	HACKENSACK RIVER BASIN, NJ&NY	4,271,000	1,191,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	KILL VAN KULL, NEWARK BAY CHANNELS	1,300,000	---	---	---	---	---	600,000	---
(FC)	NAMAN & SUFFERN (CP&E)	420,000	---	---	---	250,000	---	50,000	---
(FDP)	PASSAIC RIVER BASIN STUDY, NJ & NY (PHASE I)	18,600,000	13,521,000	1,513,000	---	2,150,000	---	1,513,000	---
(FC)	PASSAIC & PEQUANNOCK RIVER (CP&E)	---	---	---	---	500,000	---	---	---
(FC)	RAHWAY RIVER BASIN, ROBINSONS BRANCH, CITY OF RAHWAY (CP&E)	650,000	450,000	105,000	---	105,000	---	---	---
(FC)	RAHWAY RIVER BASIN AT SPRINGFIELD (CP&E)	980,000	875,000	105,000	---	105,000	---	105,000	---
(FDP)	RARITAN RIVER BASIN	3,813,000	3,014,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	NEW MEXICO								
(FDP)	PECOS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	400,000	---	---	---	---	---	100,000	---
(FC)	PUERCO RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, GALLUP, N.MEX (CEP)	340,000	---	---	---	---	---	340,000	---
(FDP)	RIO GRANDE AND TRIBUTARIES, NM & CO	7,880,000	5,058,000	425,000	---	425,000	---	425,000	---
(FC)	RIO GRANDE & TRIBS - MID RIO GRANDE BERNALILLO TO BELEN (CP&E)	2,300,000	500,000	600,000	---	600,000	---	900,000	---
(FC)	RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY TRUTH OR CONSEQUENCES UNIT	1,210,000	547,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
	NEW YORK								
(N)	ARTHUR KILL CHANNEL, HOWLAND HOOK MARINE TERMINAL	667,000	624,000	43,000	---	43,000	---	43,000	---
(N)	BUFFALO HARBOR	2,020,000	1,750,000	120,000	---	120,000	---	120,000	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
(FDP)	CATTARAUGUS CREEK	357,000	59,000	75,000	---	75,000	---	75,000	---
(FDP)	DELAWARE RIVER BASIN, NY, PA (ICE JAMS)	480,000	100,000	120,000	---	120,000	---	120,000	---
(FC)	SAW MILL RIVER, ELMSFORD & GREENBURGH	6,480,000	490,000	---	---	---	200,000	---	---
(COMP)	GENESEE RIVER BASIN AUTH REPORT	768,000	185,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	GREAT LAKES TO HUDSON RIVER WW	6,270,000	965,800	---	---	150,000	---	---	---
(N)	NY HARBOR AND ADJACENT CHANNELS, NY & NJ	7,035,000	3,875,000	870,000	---	870,000	---	870,000	---
(N)	REYNOLDS CHANNEL, JAMAICA BAY	---	---	---	---	150,000	---	---	---
(N)	SHINNECOCK INLET	1,000,000	205,000	---	100,000	---	350,000	---	100,000
(N)	ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY ADDDITIONAL LOCKS	3,784,000	2,964,000	470,000	---	470,000	---	470,000	---
(FC)	WESTCHESTER CTY STREAMS-MAMARONECK AND SHELDRAKE RIVERS (CP&E)	2,640,000	805,000	300,000	---	700,000	---	300,000	---
	NORTH CAROLINA								
(FDP)	EASTERN NORTH CAROLINA ABOVE CAPE LOOKOUT	1,487,000	242,000	160,000	---	160,000	---	160,000	---
(FDP)	MEUSE RIVER	2,025,000	1,237,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	ROANOKE RIVER SOUTH BOSTON AND VICINITY, NC & VA	2,523,000	1,983,000	360,000	---	360,000	---	360,000	---
	NORTH DAKOTA								
(FDP)	SOURIS RIVER BASIN	500,000	---	---	---	---	---	200,000	---
(FC)	SHEYENNE RIVER	24,400,000	2,475,000	---	---	---	---	---	500,000
	OHIO								
(FC)	CENTRAL OHIO AT NELSONVILLE LPP (CP&E)	690,000	375,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	CENTRAL OHIO SURVEY	3,775,000	2,675,000	450,000	---	450,000	---	450,000	---
(FDP)	CUYAHOGA RIVER BASIN	1,402,000	1,168,000	185,000	---	185,000	---	185,000	---
(FC)	FAIRFIELD (CP&E)	600,000	100,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(N)	GALLIPOLIS LOCK & DAM, OH & WV (CP&E)	7,160,000	3,660,000	---	---	---	2,000,000	---	2,000,000
(DE)	MAUMEE BAY STATE PARK (CP&E)	---	---	---	---	250,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	MIAMI RIVER LITTLE MIAMI RIVER AND MILL CREEK BASINS	4,194,000	3,744,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---

Savannah Harbor comprehensive study, Ga.—Within available funds, the Committee expects the Corps to continue the expanded study which was initiated in the fiscal year 1984 Energy and Water Development appropriation bill. This work should include new economic analyses, plan reformulation, and coordination and a new two-dimensional hydraulic model needed to sufficiently define changes in salinity and shoaling patterns in Savannah River as recently approved. The Committee expects the Corps to expend such sums as are necessary for the study's requirements for fiscal year 1985, but not to exceed $400,000.

James River improvement program, S. Dak.—The Corps of Engineers is directed to use up to $300,000 of available funds to conduct topographic surveys and to evaluate channel restoration techniques related to the James River improvement program in South Dakota.

Chesapeake Bay shoreline erosion, Md., Va., and Pa.—The Committee has included $250,000 for the Corps to undertake a reconnaissance survey of the bay-wide shore erosion problems and the impact of erosion on water related resources in the Chesapeake Bay.

Malheur Lake, Oreg.—The Committee is aware of the serious flooding situation that currently exists in the area of Malheur Lake in Harvey County, Oreg. Recent flooding has caused serious damage to the railroad line and other major transportation systems which could have severe impact on the surrounding area.

In light of the current situation and the potential for future flooding in the area, the Committee has provided $330,000 for the Corps to investigate, under the authority of the Upper Snake River and tributaries study, possible solutions and alternatives to the serious flooding at Malheur Lake. The Committee directs the Corps to review existing data and undertake the reconnaissance level study, and report on the economic feasibility of possible solutions as soon as possible.

Review of completed projects.—The Committee has provided $7,755,000 for review of completed projects, including $6,000,000 to continue detailed planning and initial design activities of the permanent solution (single retention structure) to the problems caused by the eruption of Mount St. Helens on the Cowlitz River and its tributaries in Washington.

Gila River and tributaries, Ariz. and New Mex.—An additional $200,000 has been provided for the Gila River and tributaries study to accelerate work on the Upper Gila, Santa Cruz, and Salt-Gila portion of the investigation. The Corps is urged to continue to expedite work on this study. If additional resources are required, the Committee expects the Corps to transfer available funds into the study.

Presque Isle, Pa.—The Committee is encouraged with the Department of the Army and OMB agreement to use $125,000 this year to conduct a review of a phase construction plan and feasibility of a smaller project which could provide a permanent solution for beach erosion at Presque Isle in Pennsylvania.

In light of this action, the Committee has included $300,000 so that continuation of engineering and design of this can remain on the original schedule.

Coordination studies with other agencies, States, and non-Federal interests.—The Committee allowance includes $500,000 under the authority of section 55 of Public Law 93–251 to develop flood control and bank stabilization measures along the South Platte River and its tributaries in Nebraska.

Tick research.—The Committee has deleted the funds provided by the House Committee for research into tick eradication. It should be pointed out that nearly $8,000,000 in tick research and eradication funding is included in the Department of Agriculture 1985 budget, therefore, the Committee believes that it is inappropriate for the Corps of Engineers to be involved in this type of research.

Gallipolis Locks and Dam, W. Va.; and Bonneville Lock and Dam, Oreg.—The Committee has received much testimony concerning the urgent need to proceed with a new Bonneville navigation lock and to replace the Gallipolis locks. Testimony presented to the Committee indicated that these are the highest priority projects based on traffic and safety conditions in the Nation's inland waterway system.

Pending project authorization, the Committee directs the Corps to use the funds provided to prepare detailed plans and specifications for these two projects.

Souris River Basin, N. Dak.—An amount of $200,000 is recommended for the Corps to review reports on the Souris River Basin and to study, in consultation with Canada, flood control and other water resource needs in the Souris River Basin.

Eastern South Dakota and Upper Big Sioux River study.—The Committee has provided an additional $100,000 for transfer to the U.S. Geological Survey for hydrologic studies of the Big Sioux aquifer.

Arkansas River Basin, Ark. and Okla.—The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to include within the ongoing Arkansas River Basin study, an investigation to determine the least costly alternative to meet the water supply needs of the central Arkansas area. The Committee has included $100,000 to undertake this work.

Republican River, Nebr. and Kans.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to conduct a reconnaissance level study of the flooding caused by the reduction in channel carrying capacity along the Republican River in Kansas and Nebraska.

Brunswick Harbor study, Ga.—Within available funds, the Committee expects the Corps to complete the present 12-month reconnaissance level study at a cost not to exceed $35,000.

Natchez Port and Levee study, Miss.—The Committee is aware that the local sponsors of the proposed project to provide additional flood free industrial land to improve the potential for industrial development associated with the Port of Natchez, Miss., have obtained a report analyzing the values of flood free industrial lands at ports from Memphis, Tenn., to Baton Rouge, La. The report prepared by a private consulting firm indicates that the Corps of Engineers' earlier estimates of the value of flood free industrial land to be protected by the proposed Natchez Levee project are substantially lower than the values assigned to sim-

ilarly situated industrial lands at Mississippi River ports from Memphis to Baton Rouge. Therefore, the Committee directs that the Corps of Engineers reevaluate its earlier land value estimates to insure that the projected values for the lands associated with the Natchez project are comparable to the actual values of industrial lands at other ports along the Mississippi River.

Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway special study.—The Committee has approved the budget request of $112,000 for the Tenn-Tom Corridor special study involving the waterway in Mississippi, Alabama, Tennessee, and Kentucky. The Committee has also approved the use of an additional $200,000 to be available, if needed, from within this general investigation account. If required during the next fiscal year, these funds would be available to complete the special corridor study in preparing for completion of navigation work on the project and for transferring the products and related activities of the study to local interests.

Passaic River Basin, N.J.—The Committee recognizes the severe impact of the recent flooding on the communities of northern New Jersey. The Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to work with the State of New Jersey, local communities, and other interested parties to reach agreement on a long-term plan to prevent future flood damage in the Passaic River Basin. The recent flooding only underscores the need for all interested parties to reach agreement on those individual measures which can be implemented so that flood protection benefits can be realized as soon as possible. The Committee stands ready to review individual or long-term plans.

East Everglades, Fla.—Within available funds, the Corps of Engineers is directed to prepare a general and detailed design memorandum for the East Everglades, including the East Shark River Slough water supply and flood protection plan.

Northeast water supply study.—Within available funds, the Committee has provided up to $1,000,000 of continuation of planning and engineering funds to advance the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers' report on the Northeast water supply study, dated March 28, 1979.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriations, 1984	$894,104,000
Budget estimate, 1985	874,000,000
House allowance	933,014,000
Committee recommendation	871,780,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−2,220,000
House allowance	−61,234,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $871,780,000. This is $61,234,000 below the House allowance and $22,324,000 under the current year level.

The following table shows each project for which funds are recommended. Immediately following the table, the Committee has outlined special reductions and changes made in the budgeted projects together with selected other Committee actions.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
(FDP)	MUSKINGUM RIVER BASIN	2,054,000	1,424,000	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
(FC)	REMO BEACH	625,000	524,000	---	101,000	---	101,000	---	101,000
	OKLAHOMA								
(COMP)	ARK RIV & TRIBS, SOUTH CENTRAL & SOUTHEAST AREAS OF OK	1,100,000	300,000	100,000	---	200,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	CANADIAN RIVER AND TRIBS, OK, TX & NM	2,600,000	1,833,000	100,000	---	250,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	PARKER LAKE (CP&E)	1,800,000	100,000	300,000	---	750,000	---	---	---
(SPEC)	ARKANSAS - RED RIVER BASINS SOLAR ENERGY INVESTIGATIONS, OK, TX & KS	1,010,000	---	---	---	550,000	---	---	---
	OREGON								
(FDP)	MALHEUR LAKE (RECON)	330,000	---	---	---	---	---	330,000	---
(N)	BONNEVILLE NAVIGATION LOCK, OR & WA (CP&E)	7,600,000	4,352,000	---	---	---	---	---	2,000,000
(N)	COLUMBIA R COAL EXPORT ASTORIA	2,530,000	1,930,000	147,000	---	147,000	---	147,000	---
(FDP)	UMPQUA RIVER & TRIBS	2,187,000	427,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(COMP)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN	2,455,000	1,311,000	340,000	---	340,000	---	340,000	---
	PENNSYLVANIA								
(FDP)	ALLEGHENY RIVER BASIN	795,000	250,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	FRANCIS E. WALTER DAM,PENNSYLVANIA-MODIFICATION	6,000,000	3,449,000	---	850,000	---	850,000	---	850,000
(FDP)	KISKIMINETAS RIVER BASIN	1,955,000	790,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	LEHIGH RIVER BASIN (HYDROPOWER) STUDY	2,200,000	1,385,000	411,000	---	411,000	---	411,000	---
(N)	LOCKS & DAMS 7 AND 8, PA & WV (MONONGAHELA RIVER)(CP&E)	2,500,000	---	---	---	1,600,000	---	1,600,000	---
(FC)	LOCK HAVEN (PHASE I) (CP&E)	1,900,000	200,000	800,000	---	800,000	---	800,000	---
(FDP)	MONONGAHELA-YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER BASIN PA, MD & WV	8,552,000	5,013,000	955,000	---	955,000	---	955,000	---
(FDP)	OHIO RIVER MAIN STEM, PA,IL,IN,OH, & WV	12,275,000	4,599,000	2,700,000	---	2,700,000	---	2,700,000	---
(BE)	PRESQUE ISLE (CP&E)	625,000	150,000	---	---	---	---	300,000	---
(MP)	PROMPTON LAKE (MODIFICATION)	2,590,000	270,000	---	400,000	---	---	---	400,000
(FC)	SUSQUEHANNA BASIN AT HARRISBURG (CP&E)	2,900,000	1,248,000	930,000	---	930,000	---	930,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	PUERTO RICO								
(FDP)	GUAMAJIBO RIVER	855,000	---	---	---	180,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	LA PLATA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	910,000	798,000	112,000	---	112,000	---	112,000	---
(FDP)	RIO GRANDE DE LOIZA	911,000	343,000	360,000	---	360,000	---	360,000	---
	SOUTH CAROLINA								
(FDP)	GILLS CREEK	1,799,000	1,234,000	370,000	---	370,000	---	370,000	---
(FDP)	LITTLE PEE DEE - PEE DEE RIVERS, SC & NC	1,602,000	453,000	470,000	---	470,000	---	470,000	---
(SP)	MYRTLE BEACH	425,000	373,000	52,000	---	52,000	---	52,000	---
	SOUTH DAKOTA								
(FDP)	EASTERN SD AND UPPER BIG SIOUX RIVER SD AND IA	2,790,000	2,213,000	240,000	---	240,000	---	340,000	---
(NP)	GREGORY COUNTY HYDROELECTRIC PUMPED STORAGE FACILITY (CP&E)	5,780,000	1,900,000	2,400,000	---	2,400,000	---	1,000,000	---
(FDP)	MISSOURI RIVER, SD, NE, ND, & MT	7,540,000	5,607,000	900,000	---	900,000	---	900,000	---
(FDP)	WESTERN DAKOTAS REGION OF SD	2,124,000	1,404,000	165,000	---	165,000	---	165,000	---
	TENNESSEE								
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF NASHVILLE	3,408,000	2,958,000	335,000	---	560,000	---	335,000	---
	TEXAS								
(NP)	BELTON LAKE HYDROPOWER	3,780,000	---	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000
(FDP)	BUFFALO BAYOU & TRIBUTARIES	6,550,000	4,587,000	900,000	---	900,000	---	900,000	---
(FDP)	COLORADO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	5,400,000	4,446,000	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000	---
(FDP)	DICKINSON BAYOU	1,080,000	350,000	225,000	---	300,000	---	225,000	---
(FDP)	JOHNSON CREEK, ARLINGTON	930,000	563,000	175,000	---	175,000	---	175,000	---
(FC)	LAKE WICHITA, HOLLIDAY CREEK AT WICHITA FALLS (CP&E)	1,370,000	1,030,000	340,000	---	340,000	---	340,000	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
(FDP)	LITTLE CYPRESS CREEK, TX & LA	1,710,000	1,265,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	PINE ISLAND BAYOU WATERSHED	1,010,000	590,000	100,000	---	250,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	RED RIVER AND TRIBS ABOVE DENISON DAM TX OK AND NM	4,180,000	1,088,000	100,000	---	400,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JACINTO RIVER & TRIBUTARIES	3,260,000	2,227,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(MP)	TOWN BLUFF HYDROPOWER	740,000	400,000	---	340,000	---	340,000	---	340,000
(MP)	TRINITY RIVER PROJECT	159,000,000	14,180,000	---	---	---	350,000	---	---
(FC)	UPPER WHITE OAK BAYOU & TRIBS., VICINITY OF HOUSTON (CP&E)	3,415,000	1,164,000	550,000	---	550,000	---	550,000	---
	UTAH								
(FDP)	COLORADO RIVER & TRIBS, ABOVE LEE FERRY, UT, AZ, CO, NM & WY	3,120,000	1,762,000	225,000	---	225,000	---	225,000	---
(FDP)	JORDAN RIVER BASIN	2,550,000	1,710,000	340,000	---	340,000	---	340,000	---
	VIRGINIA								
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS (DEEPENING) (CP&E)	12,400,000	7,600,000	2,000,000	---	2,000,000	---	2,000,000	---
(FC)	RICHMOND (LOCAL PROTECTION) (PHASE I) (CP&E)	3,800,000	830,000	700,000	---	1,700,000	---	700,000	---
(FDP)	ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN	2,812,000	1,732,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(BE)	VIRGINIA BEACH (PHASE I)	2,220,000	---	---	---	---	---	200,000	---
(N)	YORK AND PAMUNKEY RIVERS	800,000	480,000	320,000	---	320,000	---	200,000	---
	WASHINGTON								
(N)	BLAIR & SITCUM WATERWAYS, TACOMA HARBOR (CP&E)	980,000	354,000	---	---	326,000	---	326,000	---
(FC)	CHEHALIS RIVER AT SOUTH ABERDEEN AND COSMOPOLIS (CP&E)	1,050,000	200,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	CHEHALIS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	2,899,000	2,577,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	EAST, WEST, AND DUWAMISH WATERWAYS, SEATTLE HARBOR (CP&E)	1,295,000	---	---	---	800,000	---	400,000	---
(N)	GRAYS HARBOR CHEHALIS & HOQUIAM RIVERS (CP&E)	2,900,000	300,000	---	---	1,900,000	---	400,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
(FDP)	MILL CREEK	864,000	269,000	225,000	---	225,000	---	225,000	---
(COMP)	PUGET SOUND AND ADJACENT WATERS	7,752,000	5,960,000	420,000	---	420,000	---	420,000	---
(N)	SEATTLE HARBOR - DUWAMISH WATERWAY	3,562,000	2,697,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(N)	SNOHOMISH RIVER (NAVIGATION)	938,000	691,000	140,000	---	140,000	---	140,000	---
(FC)	YAKIMA RIVER AT UNION GAP (CP&E)	535,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
	WEST VIRGINIA								
(N)	BIG SANDY RIVER, WV, KY & VA	3,627,000	2,982,000	180,000	---	180,000	---	180,000	---
(FDP)	GUYANDOTTE RIVER BASIN, VIC LOGAN & HULLENS	2,119,000	1,869,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(N)	KANAWHA RIVER	3,540,000	2,400,000	100,000	---	350,000	---	100,000	---
(COMP)	KANAWHA BASIN COMPREHENSIVE (AUTHORIZATION REPORTS), WV, VA & NC	4,176,000	3,504,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
	WISCONSIN								
(N)	GREEN BAY HBR (1962 MODIFICATION)	530,000	375,000	---	95,000	---	95,000	---	95,000
(FC)	STATE ROAD AND EBNER COULEES	1,900,000	1,202,000	---	285,000	---	285,000	---	285,000
	REVIEW OF AUTHORIZED PROJECTS								
	RESTUDY OF DEFERRED PROJECTS	---	---	330,000	---	530,000	---	330,000	---
	LUKFATA LAKE, OK (HYDROPOWER STUDY)	---	---	---	---	(200,000)	---	---	---
	REVIEW OF COMPLETED PROJECTS	---	---	5,755,000	---	5,855,000	---	7,755,000	---
	HUGO LAKE, OK (HYDROPOWER STUDY)	---	---	(100,000)	---	(200,000)	---	(100,000)	---
	REVIEW FOR DEAUTHORIZATION	---	---	180,000	---	180,000	---	180,000	---
	TOTAL			6,265,000	---	6,565,000	---	8,265,000	---
	COORDINATION STUDIES WITH OTHER AGENCIES	---	---	5,585,000	---	6,385,000	---	4,985,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA								
	STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY)	---	---	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
	PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE)	---	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
	INTERNATIONAL WATERS STUDIES	---	---	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
	FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES	---	---	7,300,000	---	7,300,000	---	6,900,000	---
	HYDROLOGIC STUDIES	---	---	235,000	---	235,000	---	235,000	---
	SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS	---	---	120,000	---	120,000	---	120,000	---
	COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION	---	---	1,600,000	---	1,600,000	---	1,400,000	---
	TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	---	---	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
	ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES	---	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	TOTAL			10,855,000	---	10,855,000	---	10,255,000	---
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	---	---	21,000,000	---	22,600,000	---	20,000,000	---
	SUBTOTAL			110,948,000	7,052,000	140,354,000	11,772,000	117,041,000	12,592,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	---	---		0	-275,000		-3,994,000	
	TOTAL GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS			118,000,000		151,851,000		125,639,000	

TYPE OF PROJECT:

(N) NAVIGATION
(FC) FLOOD CONTROL
(BE) BEACH EROSION CONTROL
(MP) MULTIPLE-PURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER
(FDP) FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION
(SP) SHORELINE PROTECTION
(SPEC) SPECIAL
(COMP) COMPREHENSIVE

(PHASE I) AUTHORIZED FOR PHASE I STAGE OF ADVANCE ENGINEERING AND DESIGN IN THE WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1974 OR 1976
(CP&E) CONTINUATION OF PLANNING AND ENGINEERING

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	ALASKA					
(FC)	CHENA RIVER LAKES	262,000,000	191,449,000	9,700,000	9,700,000	9,700,000
(N)	KAKE HARBOR	11,400,000	811,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
(MP)	SMETTISHAM	150,000,000	87,953,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
	ARIZONA					
(FC)	PHOENIX AND VICINITY (STAGE 2 AND REMAINING WORK)	257,200,000	35,097,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000
	ARKANSAS					
(N)	MCCLELLAN-KERR ARK RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM LOCKS AND DAMS, AR & OK	544,300,000	538,516,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
(N)	OUACHITA & BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	253,000,000	206,524,000	2,000,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
	CALIFORNIA					
(FC)	CORTE MADERA CREEK	10,000,000	7,285,000	---	250,000	---
(FC)	CUCAMONGA CREEK	93,900,000	92,447,000	1,453,000	1,453,000	1,453,000
(FC)	DRY CREEK(WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL	338,000,000	279,335,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000
(FC)	FAIRFIELD VICINITY STREAMS	19,600,000	1,107,000	1,200,000	250,000	---
(N)	FISHERMAN'S WHARF AREA	6,300,000	350,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(BE)	IMPERIAL BEACH, SAN DIEGO COUNTY	3,340,000	2,847,000	493,000	493,000	493,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
(FC)	LACDA (LOS ANGELES RIVER) (REHAB)	44,700,000	5,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
(FC)	LOWER SAN JOAQUIN RIVER	5,000,000	750,000	---	2,000,000	---
(FC)	LYTLE AND WARM CREEKS	37,200,000	35,100,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS	72,200,000	8,350,000	4,000,000	250,000	---
(MP)	NEW MELONES LAKE	378,000,000	338,838,000	4,500,000	7,800,000	4,500,000
(FC)	PAJARO RIVER	2,390,000	450,000	1,300,000	---	---
(N)	PORT SAN LUIS, SAN LUIS OBISPO HARBOR	10,600,000	570,000	---	600,000	400,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER CHICO LANDING TO RED BLUFF	14,700,000	9,895,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	3,000,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT (DEF CORR)	75,875,000	68,925,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER & MAJOR AND MINOR TRIBUTARIES	11,900,000	11,584,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT	100,000,000	47,846,000	2,500,000	4,000,000	2,500,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON	203,000,000	25,998,000	18,400,000	18,400,000	18,400,000
(FC)	SAN LUIS REY RIVER	29,200,000	2,844,000	5,000,000	---	---
(FC)	SWEETWATER RIVER	17,400,000	3,625,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
(FC)	WALNUT CREEK	74,300,000	37,576,000	11,400,000	11,400,000	11,400,000
(FC)	WILDCAT & SAN PABLO CREEKS	19,400,000	1,430,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
	COLORADO					
(FC)	CHATFIELD LAKE	95,100,000	88,977,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
	FLORIDA					
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR	22,700,000	7,162,000	---	4,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	CENTRAL & SOUTHERN FLORIDA	791,000,000	280,156,000	11,500,000	11,500,000	11,500,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
(FC)	DADE COUNTY	47,700,000	32,944,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
(BE)	DUVAL COUNTY	13,200,000	7,569,000	3,900,000	3,900,000	3,900,000
(FC)	EAST EVERGLADES	1,750,000	---	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	FOUR RIVER BASINS	204,000,000	71,071,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(BE)	PALM BEACH COUNTY (REIMB)	7,400,000	4,171,000	2,100,000	2,100,000	2,100,000
(BE)	PINELLAS COUNTY	14,900,000	3,240,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
(N)	TAMPA HARBOR-MAIN CHANNEL	176,000,000	151,577,000	13,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000
	GEORGIA					
(MP)	RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA AND SC	538,000,000	406,090,000	27,000,000	27,000,000	27,000,000
	HAWAII					
(N)	BARBERS POINT HARBOR, OAHU	57,900,000	46,073,000	11,827,000	11,827,000	11,827,000
(FC)	KAHOMA STREAM	14,900,000	3,739,000	3,400,000	---	---
	IDAHO					
(MP)	DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR	328,100,000	325,354,000	2,746,000	2,746,000	2,746,000
	ILLINOIS					
(N)	BRANDON ROAD LOCK AND DAM (REHAB)	17,500,000	5,400,000	10,800,000	10,800,000	10,800,000
(FC)	EAST ST. LOUIS AND VICINITY	34,900,000	9,368,000	3,100,000	3,100,000	3,100,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
(FC)	KASKASKIA ISLAND DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT.....	15,700,000	7,443,000	3,600,000	3,600,000	3,600,000
(N)	KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION.....	145,000,000	126,591,000	5,300,000	5,300,000	5,300,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM NO 26, MISSISSIPPI RIVER ALTON, IL AND MO	829,000,000	259,107,000	89,500,000	89,500,000	89,500,000
(N)	LOCKPORT LOCK (REHAB).....	20,200,000	8,400,000	11,800,000	11,800,000	11,800,000
(N)	LOCKS AND DAM 53, IL & KY (REHAB).....	6,060,000	3,855,000	1,240,000	1,240,000	1,240,000
(FC)	MAUVAISE TERRE LEVEE, NAPLES.....	600,000	---	---	600,000	---
(FC)	MCGEE CREEK DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT.....	25,500,000	23,320,000	2,180,000	2,180,000	2,180,000
(FC)	MILAN.....	14,400,000	10,238,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
(FC)	ROCKFORD.....	9,860,000	8,329,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
(N)	SMITHLAND LOCKS AND DAM, IL, IN, & KY.....	276,500,000	268,076,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
	INDIANA					
(FC)	EVANSVILLE.....	49,900,000	27,750,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
	IOWA					
(FC)	AMES LAKE.....	46,500,000	907,000	---	250,000	---
(FC)	BETTENDORF.....	14,500,000	7,067,000	3,900,000	3,900,000	3,900,000
(FC)	CORALVILLE LAKE.....	27,244,000	24,207,000	3,037,000	3,037,000	3,037,000
(FC)	DAVENPORT.....	28,900,000	2,890,000	2,300,000	---	---
(FC)	LITTLE SIOUX RIVER (DEF CORR).....	20,300,000	17,033,000	3,267,000	3,267,000	3,267,000
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS, & MO.....	194,000,000	86,878,000	650,000	900,000	900,000
(FC)	SAYLORVILLE LAKE.....	120,000,000	102,882,000	---	7,400,000	---
(FC)	WATERLOO.....	50,000,000	47,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	KANSAS					
(FC)	EL DORADO LAKE	90,300,000	87,909,000	2,391,000	2,391,000	2,391,000
	KENTUCKY					
(FC)	BIG SOUTH FORK NATIONAL RIVER & RECREATION AREA, KY&TN	103,522,000	72,854,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
(FC)	PAINTSVILLE LAKE	61,400,000	55,562,000	1,300,000	2,100,000	1,300,000
(FC)	SOUTHWESTERN JEFFERSON COUNTY	62,800,000	37,831,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
(FC)	TAYLORSVILLE LAKE	93,000,000	81,352,000	3,100,000	3,100,000	3,100,000
(FC)	YATESVILLE LAKE	91,800,000	30,045,000	---	20,000,000	5,000,000
	LOUISIANA					
(FC)	BAYOU BODCAU AND TRIBUTARIES	24,100,000	5,307,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
(FC)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	457,000,000	153,069,000	17,500,000	17,500,000	17,500,000
(FC)	LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	61,300,000	32,602,000	5,100,000	5,100,000	5,100,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO	170,000,000	16,080,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER-GULF OUTLET	499,000,000	79,140,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	MORGAN CITY AND VICINITY (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	25,800,000	1,668,000	280,000	280,000	280,000
(FC)	NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	132,300,000	51,739,000	4,800,000	4,800,000	4,800,000
(N)	RED RIVER EMERGENCY BANK PROTECTION, LA, AR, OK & TX	59,600,000	56,346,000	3,254,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY-MS RIVER TO SHREVEPORT	1,498,000,000	518,875,000	80,100,000	93,990,000	93,990,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	MAINE					
(M)	JONESPORT HARBOR	8,770,000	265,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
	MARYLAND					
(M)	BALTIMORE HARBOR & CHANNELS, MD & VA	280,000,000	3,600,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
(M)	OCEAN CITY HARBOR & INLET & SINEPUXENT BAY (SO JETTY) (REHAB)	3,700,000	2,100,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
	MINNESOTA					
(FC)	BASSETT CREEK	21,300,000	7,690,000	6,000,000	---	---
(FC)	BIG STONE LAKE AND WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD	12,300,000	11,840,000	460,000	460,000	460,000
(FC)	MANKATO AND NORTH MANKATO	97,100,000	55,550,000	9,500,000	9,500,000	9,500,000
(FC)	WINONA	30,100,000	28,047,000	2,053,000	2,053,000	2,053,000
	MISSISSIPPI					
(FC)	TOMBIGBEE RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, MS & AL	44,000,000	14,309,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	MISSOURI					
(FC)	BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY	129,000,000	10,745,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
(MP)	CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE	330,000,000	310,767,000	7,600,000	7,600,000	7,600,000
(MP)	HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR	544,000,000	510,065,000	7,400,000	7,400,000	7,400,000
(FC)	LITTLE BLUE RIVER CHANNEL	27,400,000	24,550,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
(FC)	LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES	139,000,000	109,703,000	13,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000
(FC)	LONG BRANCH LAKE	20,200,000	17,831,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS) MO & IL	186,000,000	102,283,000	3,700,000	3,700,000	3,700,000
	NEBRASKA					
(FC)	PAPILLION CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES	46,000,000	40,163,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
	NEW JERSEY					
(N)	BARNEGAT INLET (DEF CORR)	21,370,000	210,000	---	5,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	ELIZABETH RIVER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT	54,600,000	49,957,000	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000
(BE)	SEABRIGHT TO OCEAN TOWNSHIP	10,900,000	---	---	1,300,000	---
	NEW YORK					
(BE)	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET TO ROCKAWAY INLET AND JAMAICA BAY.	26,800,000	15,650,000	2,250,000	2,250,000	2,250,000
(FC)	ELLICOTT CREEK	13,600,000	2,480,000	2,700,000	---	---

Yatesville Lake, Ky.—The Committee has included $5,000,000 for the Yatesville Lake project in Kentucky, which together with more than $13,000,000 in carryover funds is sufficient to continue construction in 1985 once action on the supplemental EIS is completed.

Tangier Island, Va.—In March of this year, a severe storm again caused extensive erosion and damage to the seawall and airfield runway at Tangier Island.

To date, more than $4,000,000 of taxpayer funds has been spent on public facilities which are currently in danger of being lost. An extension to the existing inadequate seawall has already been designed and with some updating it is ready for implementation.

In light of the emergency situation, the Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to use available funds to bring project design and cost estimates up to date so that construction can begin at the earliest possible time. Further, the Committee directs the Corps to use its emergency authority to protect the Island's airport runway from further damage.

Sacramento River, Chico Landing to Red Bluff, Calif.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 over the budget request for the Corps to undertake additional bank protection work. The Committee urges the Corps and the project sponsor to work with the various interests involved in this project to arrive at needed improvements which minimize effects on habitat and fishery values.

Elk Creek Lake, Oreg.—The Committee recommendation includes $10,000,000 to resume construction on the Elk Creek Lake project in Oregon. Elk Creek Lake was authorized in 1962 as an integral part of a three-dam system for flood control in the Rogue River Basin.

Construction of the Elk Creek Lake project was initiated in February 1971. Work completed to date includes construction of bypass and access roads and the stockpiling of construction material. In addition, all lands for the project have been acquired.

A recent reanalysis of the project costs indicates that construction of the Elk Creek Lake, as part of the authorized 3-dam system is economically justified with a benefit to cost ratio of 1.3 to 1. The water and related resource and other needs in the area remain unmet.

Therefore, in line with the Committee action on the 1982 Energy and Water appropriations bill which provided funds to update project plans and specifications, the Committee feels that project construction should be resumed. The $10,000,000 recommended provides sufficient funding to resume road relocations and main dam construction.

Small flood control projects (section 205).—The allowance provided by the Committee includes $500,000 for the Salyersville, Ky., project.

Red River Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport, La.—The bill includes $93,990,000 for the Red River Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport, La., project. An amount of $500,000 is also provided in the bill for construction of lock and dam No. 3. The Corps of Engineers is directed, with the additional funds provided for the project, to proceed with construction of lock and dam No. 3 and to expedite planning and design on the remainder of the overall project. The Corps is further di-

rected to proceed with bank stabilization and channel realinement at a rate so as not to delay opening the project to navigation. Within available funds, the Corps should take the necessary steps to stabilize the banks adjacent to the railroad right-of-way at Carrol Cutoff (mile 229) until such time as the river is realined as part of the work on pool No. 4.

Canaveral Harbor, Fla.—The Committee notes that funds to initiate construction of the Canaveral Harbor, Fla., project modification, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1962, were appropriated in fiscal year 1964. The barge canal and barge lock portion of the project was completed in 1965, and part of the harbor extension was completed in 1974. The Committee also notes that the west turning basin extension, which was not needed at the time the previous work was accomplished, was funded for construction in fiscal years 1982 through 1984. Under the authorized local cooperation requirements, the Canaveral Port Authority, the local sponsor of the project, will be required to fund approximately $2,000,000 for dredged material disposal, dike and bulkhead construction, and utility relocations for work connected with the west turning basin. The Port Authority will also be required to bear the cost of dredging berthing areas associated with the harbor extension at an estimated cost of $1,700,000. In addition, the port plans to spend an additional $40,000,000 over the next 8 to 10 years to develop the west turning basin. In view of the fact that the west turning basin extension of the Canaveral Harbor project is part of the work that was planned for accomplishment when the project was first funded for construction in fiscal year 1964 and the substantial non-Federal investment which will be made by the port, the Committee has included bill language directing the Corps to construct the west turning basin extension with funds provided in the fiscal year 1985 appropriations, in accordance with the local cooperation requirements authorized by Congress for the project in the 1962 River and Harbor Act.

Lake Darling, Souris River, N. Dak.—The Committee has included $3,000,000 for engineering and design and construction of the Lake Darling, N. Dak., project and associated upstream and downstream flood control measures. This project was authorized by Public Law 97–88 with the intent that the storage capacity of the existing Lake Darling be increased, to provide urgently needed flood control, by raising the design pool level by about 4 feet, in a manner determined advisable by the Chief of Engineers. The Committee has included funds for the Corps to construct the Velva feature and the Lake Darling modification at the earliest possible date.

Paintsville Lake, Ky.—Within available construction general funds, the Corps is directed to use $800,000, in addition to the amount included in the bill, for the relocation of the Mine Fork Road which is part of the Paintsville Lake project in Kentucky.

Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy and Cumberland Rivers, W. Va., Ky., and Va.—The Committee is aware that recent flooding in the Tug, Levisa, and Upper Cumberland Basins caused damages ex-

ceeding $207,000,000 according to estimates by the Army Corps of Engineers. The severity of this flood underscores the need for immediate and continued action to protect the individuals, homes, and businesses in these valleys. The Committee, therefore, directs the Corps to report, within 30 days, on its full construction capability for 1985 and provide a schedule of projected annual appropriation requirements for the authorized section 202 project. Further, the Committee expects the Corps to keep appropriate interested parties, including Members of Congress, informed on changes in funding requirements. An additional $2,000,000 above the budget request of $10,000,000 is recommended to accelerate the construction of structural features of section 202 projects and the Corps is directed to fund any additional fiscal year 1985 structural capability with moneys saved from other construction projects.

Small navigation (section 107) projects.—The Committee has included $125,000 under section 107 small navigation projects for the Wailoa River Harbor.

Port San Luis, San Luis Obispo Harbor, Calif.—The Committee has provided $400,000 for the Corps of Engineers to conduct a reevaluation study of the needs at the port. Additional protective works could be required in light of the $26,000,000 in damages incurred during the severe 1983 winter storm.

Cooper River, Charleston Harbor, S.C.—The Committee has been informed that while filling the forebay canal at the Cooper River, Charleston Harbor project, seepage began through the north embankment. The Committee has added an additional $5,000,000 over the budget request in order to make necessary repairs to the north embankment.

Clark Hill Lake, S.C.—Recently the Corps of Engineers determined that 3,000 acres of Federal land at Clark Hill Lake in McCormick County, S.C., are excess to project needs. Disposal procedures are now underway. In view of the 22-percent unemployment rate in McCormick County, State and local economic development officials are eager to see this land returned to the tax rolls and used for desperately needed job-creating opportunities. The Committee expects that the sale of the excess acreage will be accomplished by the General Services Administration by September 30, 1985.

Libby Dam (Lake Koocanusa), Idaho and Mont.—The Committee directs that $900,000 of available funds, the balance of the funds authorized for section 56 of Public Law 93–251 (88 Stat. 12), shall be used by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to compensate the landowners of leveed and unleveed tracts of land in Kootenai Flats, Boundary County, Idaho, for additional pumping costs and other damages such as bank erosion resulting from the duration of higher flows during drawdown operations at Libby Dam. In carrying out its mandate, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is also to carry out remedial works pursuant to the intent of Congress in authorizing this statute as is found in S. Rept. 93–615 on S. 2798 of the 93d Congress, 1st session.

Misteguay Creek flood control project, Michigan.—The Secretary of the Army is directed to reimburse Saginaw County, Mich., not to exceed $25,000 for the acquisition cost of certain lands within the Misteguay Creek flood control project from funds available during fiscal year 1985.

Cooper Lake and channels, Texas.—Although the Committee has not included funds in fiscal year 1985 for the Cooper Lake and channels project, it continues to support completion of the project if litigation related to the environmental consequences of the project is resolved. The Congress has consistently provided funds in prior years for this project with the expectation that pending litigation would have been resolved. Consequently, it is the Committee's understanding that adequate funds are available to resume construction activities on the project when the Corps of Engineers is allowed to do so. However, if these funds are not adequate, the Committee is open to proposals from the Corps of Engineers to shift other available funds to the Cooper Lake and channels project.

Ouachita and Black River navigation project, Arkansas.—The Committee has appropriated a total of $3,500,000 for this project, of which $1,500,000 is made available until expended solely for the construction of access points and recreation facilities at the Felsenthal National Wildlife Refuge.

Missouri River levee system, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri.—The Committee allowance of $900,000 for the Missouri River levee system includes $250,000 for the levee unit L–15 project.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Appropriations, 1984	$10,000,000
Budget estimate, 1985	10,000,000
House allowance	10,000,000
Committee recommendation	30,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+20,000,000
House allowance	+20,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $30,000,000 for flood control and coastal emergencies. This is $15,000,000 below the average annual expenditure from the emergency fund per year.

The funds recommended provide for advance preparation measures associated with flood emergencies, flood fighting and rescue operations, and other emergency work.

The Committee is aware of the serious flooding, tornados, and other emergencies which have occurred throughout the Nation including recent severe floods in the Southeast and Northeast, and the substantial potential for further flooding throughout the entire Mississippi River Basin, the Pacific Northwest, the Great Basin, the Colorado River Basin, and the central part of the United States.

Additional funding is also required to complete work to eliminate the danger from possible failure of the debris dam at Spirit Lake, which the Corps of Engineers indicates is of the highest priority.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
(FC)	HERKIMER (DEF CORR)	---	---	---	250,000	---
(N)	IRONDEQUOIT BAY	4,250,000	2,000,000	2,250,000	2,250,000	2,250,000
(N)	NY HARBOR COLLECTION & REMOVAL OF DRIFT PROJECT, NY & NJ	53,500,000	15,599,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
	NORTH CAROLINA					
(N)	AIWW-REPLACEMENT OF FEDERAL HIGHWAY BRIDGES	44,100,000	11,397,000	4,800,000	4,800,000	4,800,000
(FC)	B. EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE	136,000,000	102,308,000	7,800,000	7,800,000	7,800,000
(FC)	CAROLINA BEACH AND VICINITY	9,770,000	7,046,000	520,000	520,000	520,000
(FC)	FALLS LAKE	167,000,000	129,871,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
(FC)	RANDLEMAN LAKE	57,400,000	6,621,000	3,000,000	---	---
	NORTH DAKOTA					
(FC)	LAKE DARLING, SOURIS RIVER	79,300,000	2,950,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	3,000,000
	OHIO					
(FC)	MILL CREEK	158,000,000	21,532,000	9,600,000	9,600,000	9,600,000
(FC)	MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES (DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE)	106,000,000	7,080,000	900,000	900,000	900,000
(FC)	MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES (REHAB)	46,500,000	16,595,000	2,200,000	2,200,000	2,200,000
(FC)	NEWARK	11,300,000	5,349,000	85,000	85,000	85,000
(FC)	POINT PLACE	9,200,000	6,799,000	1,850,000	1,850,000	1,850,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	OKLAHOMA					
(FC)	ARCADIA LAKE	85,300,000	59,064,000	11,500,000	11,500,000	9,000,000
(FC)	COPAN LAKE	79,872,000	77,072,000	---	2,300,000	---
(MP)	EUFAULA LAKE (BRIDGE REPLACEMENT)	1,700,000	---	---	1,700,000	---
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE	55,459,000	53,087,000	---	11,500,000	---
(FC)	SKIATOOK LAKE	110,300,000	101,220,000	2,375,000	2,375,000	2,375,000
	OREGON					
(MP)	BONNEVILLE SECOND POWERHOUSE, OREGON & WASHINGTON	624,000,000	610,063,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
(FC)	ELK CREEK LAKE (RESUMPTION)	124,000,000	11,863,000	---	1,000,000	10,000,000
(MP)	JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, LAKE UMATILLA, OR & WA	512,000,000	494,318,000	5,700,000	5,700,000	10,700,000
(FC)	LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION, OR & WA	24,800,000	16,425,000	2,200,000	2,200,000	2,200,000
(N)	SIUSLAW RIVER AND BAR	30,400,000	10,925,000	8,600,000	8,600,000	8,600,000
(FC)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION	31,000,000	23,297,000	1,050,000	1,050,000	1,050,000
	PENNSYLVANIA					
(FC)	CONNEAUT LAKE (MODIFICATION)	3,720,000	1,020,000	1,300,000	---	---
(N)	EMSWORTH LOCKS AND DAMS OHIO RIVER (REHAB)	37,100,000	36,115,000	985,000	985,000	985,000
(N)	MONTGOMERY LOCKS AND DAM OHIO RIVER (REHAB)	30,100,000	4,000,000	7,100,000	7,100,000	7,100,000
(BE)	PRESQUE ISLE	15,366,000	10,276,000	1,160,000	1,160,000	1,160,000
(FC)	WYOMING VALLEY (REMEDIAL WORK) (DEF CORR)	29,000,000	19,015,000	7,600,000	7,600,000	7,600,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	PUERTO RICO					
(N)	PONCE HARBOR	9,120,000	270,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
(FC)	PORTUGUES & BUCANA RIVERS	308,000,000	103,626,000	27,000,000	27,000,000	27,000,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA					
(N)	COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR	172,800,000	170,803,000	1,997,000	1,997,000	6,997,000
	TEXAS					
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL (1968 ACT)	81,100,000	30,375,000	10,100,000	10,100,000	10,100,000
(FC)	EL PASO	71,100,000	47,279,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
(N)	FREEPORT HARBOR (1970 ACT)	53,700,000	468,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
(N)	FREEPORT HARBOR (1970 ACT) (RELOC OF NORTH JETTY)	13,000,000	3,775,000	2,350,000	---	---
(FC)	GRAPEVINE LAKE (REHAB)	11,100,000	6,900,000	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000
(FC)	JOE POOL LAKE	190,600,000	147,288,000	18,100,000	18,100,000	18,100,000
(N)	MOUTH OF COLORADO RIVER	32,300,000	5,120,000	4,800,000	4,800,000	4,800,000
(FC)	RAY ROBERTS LAKE	280,000,000	108,095,000	58,000,000	58,000,000	58,000,000
(FC)	RED RIVER LEVEES & BANK STABILIZATION BELOW DENISON DAM, TX, AR & LA	57,650,000	18,005,000	---	2,000,000	---
(FC)	SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT	85,200,000	39,318,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
(FC)	SAN GABRIEL RIVER	155,000,000	101,652,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
(FC)	TAYLORS BAYOU	64,400,000	7,843,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
(FC)	VINCE AND LITTLE VINCE BAYOUS	20,000,000	11,168,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	VIRGINIA					
(FC)	HAYSI LAKE	10,100,000	---	---	600,000	---
(FC)	VIRGINIA BEACH STREAMS, CANAL NO. TWO	3,630,000	1,420,000	2,210,000	---	---
	WASHINGTON					
(MP)	CHIEF JOSEPH ADDITIONAL UNITS	387,000,000	332,534,000	13,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000
(N)	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL (REHAB)	6,800,000	5,795,000	1,005,000	1,005,000	1,005,000
(MP)	LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH & WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR & ID	177,000,000	85,431,000	17,700,000	17,700,000	17,700,000
(FC)	MILL CREEK LAKE (REHAB)	17,400,000	13,798,000	2,100,000	2,100,000	2,100,000
	WEST VIRGINIA					
(FC)	BEECH FORK LAKE	47,900,000	40,392,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
(FC)	LEVISA & TUG FORKS OF THE BIG SANDY & CUMBERLAND RIVERS, WV, VA & KY	184,000,000	31,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	12,000,000
(FC)	STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE	198,000,000	114,010,000	27,000,000	27,000,000	27,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	MISCELLANEOUS					
	SMALL NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 107).....	---	---	9,875,000	11,191,000	9,875,000
	MITIGATION OF SHORE DAMAGES ATTRIBUTABLE TO NAV PROJ (SECTION 111).....	---	---	275,000	375,000	275,000
	SMALL BEACH EROSION CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 103)....	---	---	975,000	1,298,000	975,000
	SMALL PROJECTS FOR FLOOD CONTROL & RELATED PURPOSES (SECTION 205).....	---	---	19,700,000	27,770,000	19,700,000
	EMERGENCY STREAMBANK & SHORELINE PROTECTION (SECTION 14).....	---	---	5,300,000	5,428,000	5,300,000
	SMALL SNAGGING & CLEARING PROJECTS (SECTION 208).....	---	---	600,000	600,000	600,000
	AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL (1965 ACT).....	---	---	7,000,000	8,551,000	7,000,000
	EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION.....	---	---	10,386,000	10,386,000	10,386,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE AND UNOBLIGATED BALANCES CARRIED FORWARD FROM FY 1984...	---	---	-61,254,000	-66,204,000	-80,000,000
	TOTAL CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL.....			874,000,000	933,014,000	871,780,000

TYPE OF PROJECT:

(N) NAVIGATION
(FC) FLOOD CONTROL
(BE) BEACH EROSION CONTROL
(MP) MULTIPLE-PURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER

Therefore, in order to meet currently identified obligations and projected requirements, and to maintain the Corp-wide disaster preparedness, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $30,000,000 to replenish the Corps' emergency fund. Because of the critical nature of the problem which exists at Spirit Lake, $20,000,000 of total available resources is provided to complete the permanent outlet.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ARKANSAS, ILLINOIS, KENTUCKY, LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI, MISSOURI, AND TENNESSEE

Appropriations, 1984	$300,480,000
Budget estimate, 1985	304,000,000
House allowance	326,309,000
Committee recommendation	310,300,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+6,300,000
House allowance	−16,009,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $310,300,000, which is $16,009,000 below the House allowance and $6,300,000 over the budget request.

The following table shows the distribution of the funds recommended with the budget request and the House allowance for activities and projects under this heading.

Yazoo Basin, erosion control demonstration.—The Committee recommends inclusion of only $500,000 of the $6,200,000 provided in the House bill to initiate new erosion control demonstration work in the Yazoo Basin.

The Committee recognizes the unique problems caused by recent tornados and flooding, but believes that more thorough analysis and detailed plans and cost estimates are needed before investing large amounts of funding.

Therefore, the Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to develop a comprehensive plan which addresses the needs caused by recent events. The Corps is directed to present the comprehensive plan and recommended solution to the Committees on Appropriations in time for consideration in the 1986 budget.

Yazoo backwater area.—Because of the unusually severe floods in recent years, there is an urgent need to assure that the Yazoo Basin waters which drain into a pocket in Issaquena County are returned into the Mississippi River. The Committee is also aware that long lead times are required to test and purchase pumps and engines of the type required for the pumping plant. Accordingly, the Committee has added $2,000,000 to the budget request and directs the Corps of Engineers to initiate site clearing and inlet and outlet construction in fiscal year 1985 and to accelerate the testing and early purchase of pumps and engines so that benefits from the works can be derived as soon as possible.

Tensas River National Wildlife Refuge.—The Committee recommendation is to complete the land acquisition program during fiscal year 1985 as authorized by law for this national wildlife refuge. In carrying out this recommendation, the Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to acquire the remaining mitigation lands, estimated to cost approximately $16,000,000, using funds provided by this bill together with unobligated balances and savings from other projects available for use in fiscal year 1985 for the necessary remaining amount.

Enid Lake, Miss.—The Committee is aware of problems with deteriorating road conditions in the vicinity of the Point Pleasant community at Enid Lake, Miss., and directs the Corps to use $350,000 of available funds to improve the roads. The Committee is also aware of the shoreline erosion problems occurring in the Point Pleasant area and of the willingness of local interests to explore possible solutions to those problems. The Corps is directed to cooperate with local interests in this effort.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Appropriations, 1984	$1,184,492,000
Budget estimate, 1985	1,297,000,000
House allowance	1,339,683,000
Committee recommendation	1,317,557,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+20,557,000
House allowance	−22,126,000

An appropriation of $1,317,557,000 is recommended, which is $22,126,000 below the House allowance.

The Committee is aware of growing operation and maintenance requirements nationwide, and the continuously changing needs and priorities. It is often necessary to accomplish work scheduled for the budget year in the current year, and it is not uncommon for the Corps to divert operation and maintenance funds to unscheduled emergency maintenance requirements.

The funding recommended is the largest level ever provided for operation and maintenance activities. The Committee is aware of the efforts of the Corps to stretch the scarce O&M dollars to cover all of its projects and to effect savings through a variety of methods. As more and more projects come into the inventory and fiscal constraints reduce budgetary resources, it is clear that the Corps will need to change its traditional approach to undertaking the required O&M work nationwide. Adjustments in lower priority programs and noncritical work should be considered. However, in optimizing its use of the limited resources available, the Corps should insure maximum public benefits for navigation, hydropower, and flood control.

The 1985 budget request was based on estimates which were developed 18 months ago. Maintenance dredging requirements in navigation channels vary with weather conditions, equipment availability, and usage. Further, good bid experience could free-up additional dollars to accomplish unscheduled work. Specific allocations impede the Corps' ability to adjust to continuously changing needs. Only if the Corps' financial flexibility to respond to emergencies and other unanticipated urgent requirements is preserved can the Chief of Engineers carry out his responsibility to perform the O&M work of greatest overall importance to the Nation.

The Committee is concerned about sizable sand shoals which have built up adjacent to the navigation channels at several Oregon coastal ports. Immediately after normal annual maintenance dredging, sand migrates back into the navigation channel reducing channel depths. Within the funds provided, the Corps is directed to over-dredge channel widths to insure that channel depths are not reduced due to sand migration.

In addition, the attention of the Corps of Engineers is directed to the following projects in need of maintenance and for which the Committee has received requests—the need for maintenance dredging at Santa Cruz Harbor and Santa Barbara Harbor, Calif.; Norfolk Harbor, Va.; and Shrewsbury River, N.J.

McNary reservoir navigation channel, Wash., and Oreg.—The Committee recommendation includes $2,000,000 to eliminate safety hazards and navigational constraints caused by severe cross currents and high flow velocities just below the Ice Harbor Lock and Dam.

The following table is included for illustrative purposes only and shows the estimated work allowances for fiscal year 1983:

32-250 O - 84 - 4

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS				
SURVEYS:				
GENERAL STUDIES:				
BOEUF-TENSAS BASIN, AR & LA	6,160,000	225,000	225,000	225,000
ST. FRANCIS RIVER BASIN BELOW WAPPAPELLO LAKE, AR & MO	3,060,000	340,000	340,000	340,000
BAYOU DU CHIEN, KY	655,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
MAYFIELD CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, KY	885,000	155,000	155,000	155,000
LARTO LAKE-SALINE LAKE AREA, LA	1,330,000	---	240,000	---
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN (WATER & LAND RESOURCES), LA	6,870,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
MISSISSIPPI & LOUISIANA ESTUARINE AREAS, LA & MS (CP&E)	42,000,000	---	300,000	300,000
SOUTHWEST MISSISSIPPI TRIBUTARIES BASIN, MS	2,300,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
YAZOO RIVER BASIN, MS	8,320,000	530,000	730,000	530,000
EASTERN ARKANSAS REGION COMPREHENSIVE STUDY, AR	2,000,000	575,000	575,000	575,000
COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA	---	260,000	260,000	260,000
ADVANCE ENGINEERING AND DESIGN:				
L'ANGUILLE RIVER BASIN, AR	25,300,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION SALINITY CONTROL STRUCTURE, LA	33,200,000	700,000	700,000	700,000

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
HARRIS FORK CREEK, TN & KY	46,400,000	130,000	130,000	130,000
SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS		3,815,000	4,555,000	4,115,000
CONSTRUCTION				
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	2,932,000,000	55,000,000	55,000,000	55,000,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	1,366,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000
ST. FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO	379,000,000	6,300,000	6,300,000	6,300,000
TENSAS BASIN, AR & LA:	(454,000,000)	(12,100,000)	(12,400,000)	(12,100,000)
BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, EXCEPT LAKE CHICOT PUMPING PLANT	---	210,000	210,000	210,000
BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, LAKE CHICOT PUMPING PLANT	---	3,514,000	3,514,000	3,514,000
RED RIVER BACKWATER AREA, EXCEPT TENSAS COCODRIE PUMPING PLANT	---	2,885,000	3,185,000	2,885,000
RED RIVER BACKWATER AREA, TENSAS COCODRIE PUMPING PLANT	---	5,491,000	5,491,000	5,491,000
TENSAS RIVER NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, LA	40,000,000	---	2,500,000	12,500,000
REELFOOT LAKE-LAKE NO 9, KY & TN	10,600,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	1,555,000,000	23,000,000	28,394,000	23,000,000

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA	25,000,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
OLD RIVER, LA	315,000,000	67,300,000	67,300,000	67,300,000
SARDIS LAKE, MS (DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE)	9,000,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
YAZOO BASIN, MS:	(1,490,000,000)	(16,370,000)	(28,870,000)	(16,370,000)
BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER	---	1,092,000	1,092,000	1,092,000
GREENWOOD	---	375,000	375,000	375,000
MAIN STEM	---	575,000	575,000	575,000
TRIBUTARIES:				
EXCEPT ASCALMORE-TIPPO AND OPPOSSUM BAYOUS	---	4,208,000	6,308,000	4,208,000
ASCALMORE-TIPPO AND OPPOSSUM BAYOUS	---	3,882,000	3,882,000	3,882,000
UPPER YAZOO PROJECTS (FORMERLY AUXILIARY CHANNEL)	---	3,560,000	6,760,000	3,560,000
YAZOO BACKWATER	---	2,678,000	3,678,000	4,678,000
DEMONSTRATION EROSION CONTROL	---	---	6,200,000	500,000
WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN	107,000,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION		214,870,000	235,564,000	229,870,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
MAINTENANCE				
BOEUF-TENSAS BASIN, AR AND LA	---	1,387,000	1,387,000	1,387,000
WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR	---	640,000	640,000	640,000
MAPPING, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	---	524,000	524,000	524,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	---	8,492,000	8,492,000	8,492,000
NORTH BANK, ARKANSAS RIVER, AR	---	287,000	287,000	287,000
SOUTH BANK, ARKANSAS RIVER, AR	---	300,000	300,000	300,000
ST. FRANCIS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, AR & MO	---	4,115,000	4,115,000	4,115,000
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	---	9,429,000	9,429,000	9,429,000
BAYOU COCODRIE & TRIBUTARIES, LA	---	98,000	98,000	98,000
BONNET CARRE SPILLWAY, LA	---	435,000	435,000	435,000
LOWER RED RIVER, SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA	---	290,000	290,000	290,000
OLD RIVER, LA	---	5,194,000	5,194,000	5,194,000
RED RIVER BACKWATER AREA, LA	---	436,000	436,000	436,000
ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	---	2,051,000	2,051,000	2,051,000
BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	---	182,000	182,000	182,000
ENID LAKE, MS	---	2,075,000	2,075,000	2,075,000
GREENWOOD, MS	---	419,000	419,000	419,000
GRENADA LAKE, MS	---	3,826,000	3,927,000	3,826,000
YAZOO BASIN, MAIN STEM, MS	---	1,207,000	1,207,000	1,207,000

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
SARDIS LAKE, MS	---	2,637,000	2,911,000	2,637,000
YAZOO BASIN, TRIBUTARIES, MS	---	1,953,000	1,953,000	1,953,000
WHITTINGTON AUXILIARY CHANNEL, MS	---	328,000	328,000	328,000
YAZOO BACKWATER, MS	---	287,000	287,000	287,000
YAZOO CITY, MS	---	260,000	260,000	260,000
WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	---	2,580,000	2,580,000	2,580,000
REVETMENT AND DIKES	---	28,191,000	28,191,000	28,191,000
DREDGING	---	21,541,000	21,541,000	21,541,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS	---	1,015,000	1,015,000	1,015,000
SUBTOTAL, MAINTENANCE		100,179,000	100,554,000	100,179,000
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS, SLIPPAGE, AND UNOBLIGATED BALANCES	---	-14,864,000	-14,364,000	-23,864,000
TOTAL, FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER & TRIBUTARIES		304,000,000	326,309,000	310,300,000

TYPE OF STUDY OR PROJECT:
(FC) FLOOD CONTROL
(FDP) FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
ALABAMA		
ALABAMA-COOSA RIVER	7,769,000	9,653,000
BAYOU CODEN	---	417,000
BAYOU LA BATRE	---	424,000
BLACK WARRIOR & TOMBIGBEE RIVERS	12,853,000	18,507,000
BON SECOUR RIVER	---	435,000
DAUPHIN ISLAND BAY	82,000	82,000
DOG & FOWL RIVERS	---	466,000
FLY CREEK	---	159,000
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (MOBILE DISTRICT)	2,488,000	5,000,000
MILLERS FERRY LOCK & DAM - WILLIAM "BILL" DANNELLY LAKE	3,054,000	3,054,000
MOBILE HARBOR	4,578,000	8,000,000
PERDIDO PASS	41,000	500,000
ROBERT F. HENRY LOCK & DAM	2,479,000	2,479,000
TENNESSEE TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS	11,063,000	11,063,000
WALTER F. GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA	3,921,000	3,921,000
ALASKA		
ANCHORAGE HARBOR	1,836,000	1,836,000
CHENA RIVER LAKES	928,000	928,000
DILLINGHAM SMALL BOAT HARBOR	571,000	571,000
HOMER HARBOR	290,000	290,000
NINILCHIK SMALL BOAT HARBOR	268,000	268,000
NOME HARBOR	716,000	716,000
STIKINE RIVER SNAGGING	18,000	18,000
ARIZONA		
ALAMO LAKE	746,000	746,000
PAINTED ROCK DAM	662,000	662,000
WHITLOW RANCH DAM	82,000	82,000
ARKANSAS		
BEAVER LAKE	2,341,000	2,341,000
BLAKELY MOUNTAIN DAM, LAKE OUACHITA	3,485,000	3,485,000
BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE	723,000	723,000
BULL SHOALS LAKE	3,394,000	3,394,000
DARDANELLE LOCK & DAM	3,350,000	3,350,000
DEGRAY LAKE	2,693,000	2,693,000
DEQUEEN LAKE	623,000	623,000
DIERKS LAKE	611,000	611,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
GILLHAM LAKE	540,000	540,000
GREERS FERRY LAKE	3,112,000	3,112,000
HELENA HARBOR	360,000	360,000
MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAV SYSTEM LOCKS AND DAMS, AR & OK	11,466,000	11,466,000
MILLWOOD LAKE	1,454,000	1,454,000
NARROWS DAM - LAKE GREESON	2,559,000	2,559,000
NIMROD LAKE	849,000	849,000
NORFORK LAKE	2,223,000	2,223,000
OSCEOLA HARBOR	462,000	462,000
OUACHITA & BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	5,357,000	5,357,000
OZARK-JETA TAYLOR LOCK & DAM	2,643,000	2,643,000
WHITE RIVER	2,058,000	2,058,000
CALIFORNIA		
BLACK BUTTE LAKE	1,119,000	1,119,000
BUCHANAN DAM - H. V. EASTMAN LAKE	1,119,000	1,119,000
COYOTE VALLEY DAM (LAKE MENDOCINO)	1,626,000	1,626,000
CRESCENT CITY HARBOR	1,750,000	1,750,000
DRIFT REMOVAL (SF HARBOR & BAY)	1,198,000	1,198,000
DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE & CHANNEL	1,608,000	1,608,000
FARMINGTON DAM	128,000	128,000
HIDDEN DAM - HENSLEY LAKE	1,069,000	1,069,000
HUMBOLDT HARBOR & BAY	3,296,000	3,296,000
ISABELLA LAKE	1,726,000	1,726,000
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA	2,884,000	2,884,000
LOS ANGELES-LONG BEACH HARBORS	600,000	600,000
LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBOR MODEL	130,000	130,000
MERCED COUNTY STREAM GROUP	130,000	130,000
MOJAVE RIVER DAM	215,000	215,000
NEW MELONES LAKE	567,000	567,000
NEW HOGAN LAKE	1,310,000	1,310,000
OAKLAND HARBOR	1,534,000	1,534,000
OCEANSIDE HARBOR	800,000	800,000
OCEANSIDE SAND BYPASS SYSTEM	---	1,000,000
PINE FLAT LAKE	1,448,000	1,448,000
REDWOOD CITY HARBOR	3,130,000	3,130,000
RICHMOND HARBOR	2,080,000	2,080,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER & TRIBS (DEBRIS CONTROL)	654,000	654,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL	105,000	105,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FT PROJECT)	3,037,000	3,037,000
SAN PABLO BAY & MARE ISLAND STRAIT	6,077,000	6,077,000
SAN FRANCISCO BAY-DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE	940,000	940,000
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR	1,363,000	1,363,000
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER	2,260,000	2,260,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN	1,974,000	1,974,000
SUCCESS LAKE	1,063,000	1,063,000
SUISUN BAY CHANNEL	711,000	711,000
TERMINUS DAM (LAKE KAWEAH)	1,089,000	1,089,000
VENTURA MARINA	2,500,000	2,500,000
YUBA RIVER	24,000	24,000
COLORADO		
BEAR CREEK LAKE	237,000	237,000
CHATFIELD LAKE	403,000	403,000
CHERRY CREEK LAKE	609,000	609,000
JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR	848,000	848,000
TRINIDAD LAKE	540,000	540,000
CONNECTICUT		
BLACK ROCK LAKE	158,000	158,000
CLINTON HARBOR	283,000	283,000
COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE	179,000	179,000
CONNECTICUT RIVER BELOW HARTFORD	1,166,000	1,166,000
HANCOCK BROOK LAKE	88,000	88,000
HOP BROOK LAKE	350,000	350,000
MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE	287,000	287,000
NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE	167,000	167,000
STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER	186,000	186,000
THOMASTON DAM	296,000	296,000
WEST THOMPSON LAKE	603,000	603,000
DELAWARE		
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE RIVER TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, DE & MD	12,651,000	12,651,000
IWW REHOBOTH BAY TO DELAWARE BAY	30,000	30,000
IWW CHINCOTEAGUE BAY TO DELAWARE BAY	3,000	3,000
WILMINGTON HARBOR	3,068,000	3,068,000
DIST OF COLUMBIA		
POTOMAC & ANACOSTIA RIVERS (DRIFT REMOVAL)	550,000	550,000
POTOMAC RIVER BELOW WASHINGTON	2,605,000	2,605,000
WASHINGTON HARBOR	1,056,000	1,056,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
FLORIDA		
APALACHICOLA BAY	265,000	265,000
BLACKWATER RIVER	86,000	86,000
CANAVERAL HARBOR	2,976,000	2,976,000
CENTRAL & SOUTHERN FLORIDA	3,878,000	3,878,000
CHARLOTTE HARBOR	1,089,000	1,089,000
CROSS-FLORIDA BARGE CANAL	1,184,000	1,184,000
EAST PASS CHANNEL	---	525,000
ESCAMBIA-CONECUH RIVERS	520,000	520,000
FERNANDINA HARBOR	2,000,000	2,000,000
FORT PIERCE HARBOR	850,000	850,000
FORT MYERS BEACH	440,000	440,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI	2,060,000	2,060,000
INTRACOASTAL WATER, CALOOSAHATCHEE RIVER TO ANCLOTE RIVER	800,000	800,000
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR	2,000,000	2,000,000
JIM WOODRUFF LOCK & DAM, FL & GA	3,730,000	3,730,000
JOHNS PASS	---	500,000
LA GRANGE BAYOU	77,000	77,000
MIAMI HARBOR	920,000	920,000
OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY	1,997,000	1,997,000
OKLAWAHA RIVER	4,000	4,000
PALM BEACH HARBOR	696,000	696,000
PANAMA CITY HARBOR	685,000	685,000
PENSACOLA HARBOR	747,000	747,000
PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR	920,000	920,000
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH	2,252,000	2,252,000
ST LUCIE INLET	860,000	860,000
ST. JOHNS RIVER, JACKSONVILLE TO LAKE HARNEY	875,000	875,000
TAMPA HARBOR	2,885,000	2,885,000
GEORGIA		
ALLATOONA LAKE	4,399,000	4,399,000
ALTAMAHA OCONEE OCMULGEE RIVERS	4,000	4,000
APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL & FL	4,060,000	4,060,000
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (SAVANNAH DISTRICT)	1,043,000	1,043,000
BRUNSWICK HARBOR	4,000,000	4,000,000
BUFORD DAM & LAKE SIDNEY LANIER	4,706,000	4,706,000
CARTERS LAKE	2,180,000	2,180,000
CLARKS HILL LAKE, GA & SC	5,216,000	5,216,000
HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC	5,413,000	5,413,000
RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM & LAKE, GA & SC	3,070,000	3,070,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL.—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA	239,000	239,000
SAVANNAH HARBOR	9,150,000	10,650,000
WEST POINT LAKE, GA & AL	3,249,000	3,249,000
HAWAII		
BARBERS POINT HARBOR, OAHU	60,000	60,000
MANELE SMALL BOAT HARBOR	400,000	400,000
IDAHO		
ALBENI FALLS DAM	2,216,000	2,216,000
DWORSHAK DAM & RESERVOIR	5,761,000	5,761,000
LUCKY PEAK LAKE	636,000	636,000
ILLINOIS		
CALUMET HARBOR & RIVER, IL & IN	1,470,000	1,470,000
CARLYLE LAKE	3,160,000	3,160,000
CHICAGO HARBOR	686,000	686,000
CHICAGO RIVER, (DIKED DISPOSAL)	110,000	110,000
CHICAGO RIVER	396,000	396,000
FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS	115,000	115,000
ILLINOIS AND MISSISSIPPI CANAL	469,000	469,000
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (LMVD PORTION)	1,272,000	1,272,000
ILLINOIS WATERWAY	11,789,000	11,789,000
KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION	2,582,000	2,582,000
LAKE SHELBYVILLE	4,249,000	4,249,000
MILL CREEK & SOUTH SLOUGH	64,000	64,000
MISSISSIPPI RIV BTWN OHIO & MO RIVERS	12,282,000	12,282,000
MISS RIV BTWN MISSOURI RIV & MINNEAPOLIS, IL, MN, WI, & IA (NCD)	39,900,000	39,900,000
MISS RIV BTWN MO RIVER & MINNEAPOLIS (LMVD)	7,776,000	7,776,000
MOUTH OF SANGAMON RIVER	24,000	24,000
NORTH BRANCH OF CHICAGO RIVER	---	150,000
REND LAKE	2,733,000	2,733,000
WAUKEGAN HARBOR	521,000	521,000
WAUKEGAN HARBOR (DIKED DISPOSAL)	512,000	512,000
INDIANA		
BROOKVILLE LAKE	392,000	392,000
CAGLES MILL LAKE	298,000	298,000
CECIL M. HARDEN LAKE	353,000	353,000
HUNTINGTON LAKE	445,000	445,000
INDIANA HARBOR (DIKED DISPOSAL)	6,660,000	6,660,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
MISSISSINEWA LAKE	373,000	373,000
MONROE LAKE	415,000	415,000
PATOKA LAKE	357,000	357,000
SALAMONIE LAKE	392,000	392,000
IOWA		
CORALVILLE LAKE	2,223,000	2,223,000
MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO MOUTH, IA & NE	9,335,000	9,335,000
MISSOURI RIVER, KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA & NE	43,000	43,000
RATHBUN LAKE	2,790,000	2,790,000
RED ROCK DAM - LAKE RED ROCK	2,275,000	2,275,000
SAYLORVILLE LAKE	2,685,000	2,835,000
KANSAS		
CLINTON LAKE	1,181,000	1,181,000
COUNCIL GROVE LAKE	622,000	622,000
EL DORADO LAKE	424,000	424,000
ELK CITY LAKE	583,000	583,000
FALL RIVER LAKE	583,000	583,000
HILLSDALE LAKE	482,000	482,000
JOHN REDMOND DAM & RESERVOIR	722,000	722,000
KANOPOLIS LAKE	1,665,000	1,665,000
MARION LAKE	646,000	646,000
MELVERN LAKE	1,231,000	1,231,000
MILFORD LAKE	1,151,000	1,151,000
PEARSON - SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE	556,000	556,000
PERRY LAKE	1,792,000	1,792,000
POMONA LAKE	970,000	970,000
TORONTO LAKE	239,000	239,000
TUTTLE CREEK LAKE	991,000	991,000
WILSON LAKE	982,000	982,000
KENTUCKY		
BARKLEY DAM - LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN	3,707,000	3,707,000
BARREN RIVER LAKE	1,060,000	1,060,000
BUCKHORN LAKE	643,000	643,000
CARR FORK LAKE	848,000	848,000
CAVE RUN LAKE	503,000	503,000
DEWEY LAKE	809,000	809,000
FISHTRAP LAKE	669,000	669,000
GRAYSON LAKE	481,000	481,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
GREEN RIVER LAKE	935,000	935,000
GREEN & BARREN RIVERS	1,822,000	1,822,000
HICKMAN HARBOR	363,000	363,000
KENTUCKY RIVER	1,627,000	1,627,000
LAUREL RIVER LAKE	778,000	778,000
MARTINS FORK LAKE	511,000	511,000
MIDDLESBORO	33,000	33,000
NOLIN LAKE	1,063,000	1,063,000
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, PA, WV, OH, IN, & IL	9,740,000	9,740,000
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, PA, WV, OH, IN, & IL	34,763,000	34,763,000
PAINTSVILLE LAKE	363,000	363,000
ROUGH RIVER LAKE	1,256,000	1,256,000
TAYLORSVILLE LAKE	433,000	433,000
WOLF CREEK DAM - LAKE CUMBERLAND	4,076,000	4,076,000
LOUISIANA		
ATCHAFALAYA RIVER & BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF & BLACK	2,970,000	2,970,000
BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY	2,480,000	2,480,000
BAYOU BONFOUCA	390,000	390,000
BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR	580,000	580,000
BAYOU TECHE	350,000	350,000
BAYOU PIERRE	35,000	35,000
CADDO LAKE	177,000	177,000
CALCASIEU RIVER & PASS	11,240,000	11,240,000
CHEFUNCTE RIV & BOGUE FALIA	190,000	190,000
FRESHWATER BAYOU	1,930,000	1,930,000
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY	12,360,000	13,260,000
HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL	2,040,000	2,040,000
LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR	200,000	200,000
MADISON PARISH PORT	215,000	215,000
MERMENTAU RIVER	990,000	990,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER-GULF OUTLET	5,505,000	9,505,000
MISS RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF	31,588,000	45,468,000
MISS RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE	1,110,000	1,110,000
RED RIVER WATERWAY MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT	1,614,000	2,464,000
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH	1,201,000	1,201,000
WALLACE LAKE	155,000	155,000
MAINE		
KENNEBUCK RIVER	269,000	269,000
PENOBSCOT RIVER	659,000	659,000
PORTLAND HARBOR	630,000	630,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
MARYLAND		
BALTIMORE HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL)	250,000	250,000
BALTIMORE HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)	51,000	51,000
BALTIMORE HARBOR & CHANNELS	14,593,000	14,593,000
BLOOMINGTON LAKE, MD & WV	996,000	996,000
CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV, MD & WV	64,000	64,000
FISHING BAY	804,000	804,000
FISHING CREEK	100,000	100,000
HONGA RIVER & TAR BAY	995,000	995,000
KNAPP NARROWS	476,000	476,000
OCEAN CITY HARBOR & INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY	400,000	400,000
POCOMOKE RIVER	680,000	680,000
SUSQUEHANNA RIVER ABOVE AND BELOW HAVRE DE GRACE	1,696,000	1,696,000
TRED AVON RIVER	827,000	827,000
WICOMICO RIVER	1,000,000	1,000,000
MASSACHUSETTS		
BARRE FALLS DAM	369,000	369,000
BIRCH HILL DAM	295,000	295,000
BUFFUMVILLE LAKE	334,000	334,000
CAPE COD CANAL	7,069,000	7,069,000
CHARLES RIVER NATURAL RIVER VALLEY STORAGE AREAS	162,000	162,000
CONANT BROOK DAM	119,000	119,000
EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE	244,000	244,000
GREEN HARBOR	528,000	528,000
HODGES VILLAGE DAM	287,000	287,000
HYANNIS HARBOR	285,000	285,000
KNIGHTVILLE DAM	698,000	698,000
LITTLEVILLE LAKE	307,000	307,000
NEW BEDFORD, FAIRHAVEN & ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER	142,000	142,000
TULLY LAKE	363,000	363,000
WEST HILL DAM	201,000	201,000
WESTVILLE LAKE	360,000	360,000
MICHIGAN		
ALPENA HARBOR	160,000	160,000
AU SABLE HARBOR	13,000	13,000
BLACK RIVER HARBOR	183,000	183,000
CHANNELS IN LAKE ST. CLAIR	387,000	387,000
CHARLEVOIX HARBOR	13,000	13,000
DETROIT RIVER	8,620,000	8,620,000
FRANKFORT HARBOR	263,000	263,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
GRAND HAVEN HARBOR & GRAND RIVER	720,000	720,000
GRAND TRAVERSE BAY HARBOR	8,000	8,000
HARBOR BEACH HARBOR	16,000	466,000
HOLLAND HARBOR	510,000	510,000
INLAND ROUTE	35,000	35,000
KEWEENAW WATERWAY	2,203,000	2,203,000
KEWEENAW WATERWAY (DIKED DISPOSAL)	76,000	76,000
LELAND HARBOR	141,000	141,000
LEXINGTON HARBOR	269,000	269,000
LUDINGTON HARBOR	1,155,000	1,155,000
MANISTEE HARBOR	23,000	23,000
MANISTIQUE HARBOR	23,000	23,000
MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI & WI (DIKED DISPOSAL)	115,000	115,000
MONROE HARBOR	1,033,000	1,033,000
MONROE HARBOR (DIKED DISPOSAL)	2,120,000	2,120,000
MUSKEGON HARBOR	189,000	189,000
NEW BUFFALO HARBOR	24,000	24,000
ONTONAGON HARBOR	136,000	136,000
PENTWATER HARBOR	184,000	184,000
POINT LOOKOUT HARBOR	1,801,000	1,801,000
PORT AUSTIN HARBOR	---	500,000
PORT SANILAC HARBOR	199,000	199,000
PORTAGE LAKE HARBOR MICHIGAN	152,000	152,000
ROUGE RIVER	1,825,000	1,825,000
SAGINAW RIVER (DIKED DISPOSAL)	1,078,000	1,078,000
SAGINAW RIVER	3,608,000	3,608,000
SAUGATUCK HARBOR	189,000	189,000
SEBEWAING RIVER	24,000	24,000
ST. CLAIR RIVER	2,155,000	2,155,000
ST. JOSEPH HARBOR	919,000	919,000
ST. JOSEPH HARBOR (DIKED DISPOSAL)	206,000	206,000
ST. MARYS RIVER	11,047,000	11,047,000
WHITE LAKE HARBOR	528,000	528,000
MINNESOTA		
BIG STONE LAKE AND WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD	201,000	201,000
DULUTH-SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI	4,354,000	4,354,000
GRAND MARAIS HARBOR	578,000	578,000
LAC QUI PARLE LAKE	306,000	306,000
MINNESOTA RIVER	353,000	353,000
ORWELL LAKE	830,000	830,000
RED LAKE RESERVOIR	63,000	63,000
RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER	1,845,000	1,845,000
ST. CROIX RIVER, MN & WI	146,000	146,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
MISSISSIPPI		
ARKABUTLA LAKE	53,000	53,000
BILOXI HARBOR	70,000	70,000
CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT	105,000	105,000
EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER	509,000	509,000
ENID LAKE	53,000	53,000
GRENADA LAKE	15,000	15,000
GULFPORT HARBOR	185,000	185,000
OKATIBBEE LAKE	714,000	714,000
PASCAGOULA HARBOR	3,011,000	3,011,000
PEARL RIVER	190,000	190,000
ROSEDALE HARBOR	240,000	240,000
SARDIS LAKE	15,000	15,000
YAZOO RIVER	60,000	60,000
MISSOURI		
CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR	252,000	252,000
CLARENCE CANNON DAM & RESERVOIR	3,451,000	3,451,000
CLEARWATER LAKE	1,254,000	1,254,000
HARRY S. TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR	5,045,000	5,045,000
LONG BRANCH LAKE	519,000	519,000
MERAMEC PARK LAKE	609,000	609,000
POMME DE TERRE LAKE	1,817,000	1,817,000
SMITHVILLE LAKE	700,000	700,000
STOCKTON LAKE	1,982,000	1,982,000
TABLE ROCK LAKE	2,974,000	2,974,000
WAPPAPELLO LAKE	66,000	66,000
MONTANA		
FORT PECK LAKE	2,879,000	2,879,000
LIBBY DAM (LAKE KOOCANUSA)	3,190,000	3,190,000
NEBRASKA		
HARLAN COUNTY LAKE	1,246,000	1,246,000
MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATION RIVER, NEB & SD	---	200,000
PAPILLION CREEK & TRIBUTARIES LAKES	403,000	403,000
SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES	685,000	685,000
NEVADA		
MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA	2,274,000	2,274,000
PINE & MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES	103,000	103,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
BLACKWATER DAM	215,000	215,000
EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE	269,000	269,000
FRANKLIN FALLS DAM	594,000	594,000
HAMPTON HARBOR	317,000	317,000
HOPKINTON-EVERETT LAKES	907,000	907,000
OTTER BROOK LAKE	478,000	478,000
PORTSMOUTH HARBOR & PISCATAQUA RIVER	467,000	467,000
SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE	414,000	414,000
NEW JERSEY		
BARNEGAT INLET	515,000	515,000
COHANSEY RIVER	700,000	700,000
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ & PA	19,885,000	19,885,000
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO TRENTON, NJ & PA	3,815,000	3,815,000
NEW JERSEY INW	1,244,000	1,244,000
NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK & PASSAIC RIVERS	1,160,000	1,160,000
NEW MEXICO		
ABIQUIU DAM	2,171,000	2,171,000
COCHITI LAKE	923,000	923,000
CONCHAS LAKE	660,000	660,000
GALISTEO DAM	144,000	144,000
JEMEZ CANYON DAM	235,000	235,000
SANTA ROSA DAM & LAKE	463,000	463,000
TWO RIVERS DAM	272,000	272,000
NEW YORK		
ALMOND LAKE	270,000	270,000
ARKPORT DAM	160,000	160,000
BAY RIDGE & RED HOOK CHANNELS	3,335,000	3,335,000
BLACK ROCK CHANNEL & TONAWANDA HARBOR	1,463,000	1,463,000
BUFFALO HARBOR	2,132,000	2,132,000
BUTTERMILK CHANNEL	1,093,000	1,093,000
DUNKIRK HARBOR	251,000	251,000
EAST ROCKAWAY INLET	1,104,000	1,104,000
EAST RIVER	690,000	690,000
EAST CHESTER CREEK	1,495,000	1,495,000
EAST SIDNEY LAKE	268,000	268,000
FIRE ISLAND INLET	1,380,000	1,380,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
HUDSON RIVER	4,575,000	4,575,000
MT. MORRIS LAKE	1,026,000	1,026,000
NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN	1,046,000	1,046,000
NEW YORK HARBOR DRIFT REMOVAL	2,600,000	2,600,000
NEW YORK & NEW JERSEY CHANNEL	830,000	830,000
NEW YORK HARBOR	5,967,000	5,967,000
NEWTOWN CREEK	1,459,000	1,459,000
OGDENSBURG HARBOR	10,000	10,000
OSWEGO HARBOR	452,000	452,000
PORT CHESTER HARBOR	932,000	932,000
PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS	440,000	440,000
ROCHESTER HARBOR	793,000	793,000
SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS	466,000	466,000
WHITNEY POINT LAKE	277,000	277,000
NORTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (WILMINGTON DISTRICT)	5,300,000	5,300,000
B. EVERETT JORDAN DAM & LAKE	895,000	895,000
BEAUFORT HARBOR	323,000	323,000
CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON	453,000	453,000
CHANNEL FROM BACK SOUND TO LOOKOUT BIGHT	207,000	207,000
FALLS LAKE	833,000	833,000
LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER	591,000	591,000
MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY	2,676,000	2,676,000
MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR	4,205,000	4,205,000
OCRACOKE INLET	10,000	10,000
SILVER LAKE HARBOR	475,000	475,000
W. KERR SCOTT DAM & RESERVOIR	1,005,000	1,005,000
WILMINGTON HARBOR	3,975,000	3,975,000
NORTH DAKOTA		
BOWMAN - HALEY LAKE	219,000	219,000
GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA	6,767,000	6,767,000
HOMME LAKE AND DAM	318,000	318,000
LAKE ASHTABULA & BALDHILL DAM	1,139,000	1,139,000
PIPESTEM LAKE	292,000	292,000
OHIO		
ALUM CREEK LAKE	452,000	452,000
ASHTABULA HARBOR	80,000	80,000
ASHTABULA HARBOR	99,000	99,000
BERLIN LAKE	1,177,000	1,177,000
CAESAR CREEK LAKE	534,000	534,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
CLARENCE J. BROWN DAM AND RESERVOIR	370,000	370,000
CLEVELAND HARBOR	9,692,000	9,692,000
CONNEAUT HARBOR	989,000	989,000
DEER CREEK LAKE	432,000	432,000
DELAWARE LAKE	413,000	413,000
DILLON LAKE	280,000	280,000
FAIRPORT HARBOR	1,043,000	1,043,000
HURON HARBOR	1,017,000	1,017,000
LORAIN HARBOR	1,551,000	1,551,000
MASSILLON	15,000	15,000
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN DAM & RESERVOIR	513,000	513,000
MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE	498,000	498,000
MUSKINGUM RIVER RESERVOIRS	3,768,000	3,768,000
NEWARK	15,000	15,000
NORTH BRANCH OF KOKOSING RIVER LAKE	185,000	185,000
PAINT CREEK LAKE	483,000	483,000
ROSEVILLE	15,000	15,000
SANDUSKY HARBOR	1,191,000	1,191,000
TOLEDO HARBOR	4,769,000	4,769,000
TOM JENKINS DAM	318,000	318,000
WEST FORK MILL CREEK LAKE	318,000	318,000
WILLIAM H. HARSHA LAKE	429,000	429,000
OKLAHOMA		
BIRCH LAKE	555,000	555,000
BROKEN BOW LAKE	1,272,000	1,272,000
CANTON LAKE	2,423,000	2,423,000
COPAN LAKE	571,000	571,000
EUFAULA LAKE	2,748,000	2,748,000
FORT GIBSON LAKE	2,573,000	2,573,000
FORT SUPPLY LAKE	582,000	582,000
GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE	345,000	345,000
HEYBURN LAKE	534,000	534,000
HUGO LAKE	1,018,000	1,018,000
HULAH LAKE	584,000	584,000
KAW LAKE	1,248,000	1,248,000
KEYSTONE LAKE	2,320,000	2,320,000
MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM	2,791,000	2,791,000
OOLOGAH LAKE	1,153,000	1,153,000
OPTIMA LAKE	568,000	568,000
PENSACOLA RESERVOIR - LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES	6,000	6,000
PINE CREEK LAKE	687,000	687,000
ROBERT S. KERR LOCK, DAM & RESERVOIR	2,320,000	2,320,000
SARDIS LAKE	534,000	534,000
SKIATOOK LAKE	673,000	673,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
TENKILLER FERRY LAKE	2,624,000	2,624,000
WAURIKA LAKE	779,000	779,000
WEBBERS FALLS LOCK & DAM	1,889,000	1,889,000
WISTER LAKE	608,000	608,000
OREGON		
APPLEGATE LAKE	524,000	524,000
BLUE RIVER LAKE	188,000	188,000
BONNEVILLE LOCK & DAM	11,568,000	11,568,000
CHETCO RIVER	866,000	866,000
COLUMBIA AND LWR WILLAMETTE RIVS BELOW VANCVR & PORT, OR & WA	14,736,000	14,736,000
COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA	4,197,000	4,197,000
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA & THE DALLES, OR & WA	327,000	327,000
COOS BAY	5,230,000	5,230,000
COOS & MILLICOMA RIVERS	194,000	194,000
COQUILLE RIVER	666,000	666,000
COTTAGE GROVE LAKE	772,000	772,000
COUGAR LAKE	686,000	686,000
DEPOE BAY	50,000	50,000
DETROIT LAKE	1,411,000	1,411,000
DORENA LAKE	445,000	445,000
FALL CREEK LAKE	272,000	272,000
FERN RIDGE DAM & LAKE	647,000	647,000
GREEN PETER-FOSTER LAKES	2,141,000	2,141,000
HILLS CREEK LAKE	865,000	865,000
JOHN DAY POWERHOUSE (MAJOR REHAB), OR & WA	6,000,000	6,000,000
JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, LAKE UMATILLA, OR & WA	7,497,000	7,497,000
LOOKOUT POINT LAKE	2,427,000	2,427,000
LOST CREEK LAKE	2,423,000	2,423,000
MCNARY LOCK & DAM, LAKE WALLULA, OR & WA	11,338,000	13,338,000
PORT ORFORD	162,000	162,000
ROGUE RIVER HARBOR AT GOLD BEACH	1,003,000	1,003,000
SIUSLAW RIVER	1,879,000	1,879,000
SKIPANON CHANNEL	286,000	286,000
TILLAMOOK BAY & BAR	242,000	242,000
UMPQUA RIVER	898,000	898,000
WILLOW CREEK LAKE	168,000	168,000
WILLAMETTE RIVER ABOVE PORTLAND & YAMHILL RIVER	173,000	173,000
WILLAMETTE RIVER AND WILLAMETTE FALLS	526,000	526,000
YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR	816,000	816,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
PENNSYLVANIA		
ALLEGHENY RIVER	5,509,000	5,509,000
ALVIN R. BUSH DAM	374,000	374,000
AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE	159,000	159,000
BELTZVILLE LAKE	668,000	668,000
BLUE MARSH LAKE	1,240,000	1,240,000
CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE	525,000	525,000
COWANESQUE LAKE	838,000	838,000
CROOKED CREEK LAKE	876,000	876,000
CURWENSVILLE LAKE	379,000	379,000
EAST BRANCH, CLARION RIVER LAKE	505,000	505,000
FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM & RESERVOIR	423,000	423,000
FRANCIS E. WALTER DAM	630,000	630,000
GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM & RESERVOIR	295,000	295,000
JOHNSTOWN	7,000	7,000
KINZUA DAM & ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA & NY	724,000	724,000
LOYALHANNA LAKE	757,000	757,000
MAHONING CREEK LAKE	508,000	508,000
MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA & WV	9,905,000	9,905,000
PROMPTON LAKE	254,000	254,000
PUNXSUTAWNEY	22,000	22,000
RAYSTOWN LAKE	2,012,000	2,012,000
SCHUYLKILL RIVER	1,835,000	1,835,000
SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA & OH	1,258,000	1,258,000
STILLWATER LAKE	180,000	180,000
TIOGA HAMMOND LAKES	1,196,000	1,196,000
TIONESTA LAKE	864,000	864,000
UNION CITY LAKE	309,000	309,000
WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE	567,000	567,000
YORK, INDIAN ROCK DAM	581,000	581,000
YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA & MD	1,038,000	1,038,000
PUERTO RICO		
ARECIBO HARBOR	500,000	500,000
MAYAGUEZ HARBOR	494,000	494,000
PONCE HARBOR (E&D AND O&M)	400,000	400,000
SAN JUAN HARBOR	1,200,000	1,200,000
SOUTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (CHARLESTON DISTRICT)	2,532,000	2,532,000
CHARLESTON HARBOR	4,505,000	4,505,000
COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR	3,556,000	3,556,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
FOLLY RIVER	41,000	41,000
GEORGETOWN HARBOR	2,431,000	2,431,000
LITTLE RIVER INLET, SC & NC	143,000	143,000
MURRELLS INLET	85,000	85,000
PORT ROYAL HARBOR	4,000	4,000
SHIPYARD RIVER	632,000	632,000
TOWN CREEK	28,000	28,000
SOUTH DAKOTA		
BIG BEND DAM - LAKE SHARPE	3,356,000	3,356,000
COLD BROOK LAKE	137,000	137,000
COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE	120,000	120,000
FORT RANDALL DAM, LAKE FRANCIS CASE	6,110,000	6,110,000
GAVINS POINT DAM LEWIS & CLARK LAKE, NE & SD	4,117,000	4,117,000
LAKE TRAVERSE AND BOIS DE SIOUX, SD & MN	203,000	203,000
OAHE DAM, LAKE OAHE, SD & ND	7,349,000	7,349,000
TENNESSEE		
CENTER HILL LAKE	2,591,000	2,591,000
CHEATHAM LOCK & DAM	2,746,000	2,746,000
CORDELL HULL DAM & RESERVOIR	2,555,000	2,555,000
DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN & KY	2,465,000	2,465,000
J. PERCY PRIEST DAM & RESERVOIR	1,732,000	1,882,000
OLD HICKORY LOCK & DAM	3,040,000	3,040,000
TENNESSEE RIVER, TN, AL, & KY	8,266,000	8,266,000
WOLF RIVER HARBOR	522,000	522,000
TEXAS		
AQUILLA LAKE	492,000	492,000
ARKANSAS-RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL (AREA 8)	373,000	373,000
BARDWELL LAKE	923,000	923,000
BELTON LAKE	1,345,000	1,345,000
BENBROOK LAKE	1,046,000	1,046,000
BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR	2,440,000	2,440,000
BUFFALO BAYOU & TRIBUTARIES	1,020,000	1,020,000
CANYON LAKE	923,000	923,000
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL (1968 ACT)	6,670,000	6,670,000
DENISON DAM - LAKE TEXOMA, TX & OK	4,044,000	4,044,000
FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM - LAKE O' THE PINES	1,433,000	1,433,000
FREEPORT HARBOR	2,370,000	2,370,000
GALVESTON HARBOR & CHANNEL	5,260,000	5,260,000
GRANGER LAKE	698,000	698,000
GRAPEVINE LAKE	1,470,000	1,470,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY	14,120,000	14,120,000
HORDS CREEK LAKE	580,000	580,000
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL	7,920,000	7,920,000
LAKE KEMP	145,000	145,000
LAVON LAKE	1,654,000	1,654,000
LEWISVILLE DAM	2,175,000	2,175,000
MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL	3,020,000	3,020,000
NAVARRO MILLS LAKE	710,000	710,000
NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN	744,000	744,000
O. C. FISHER DAM & LAKE	662,000	662,000
PAT MAYSE LAKE	728,000	728,000
PROCTOR LAKE	1,190,000	1,190,000
SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY	7,520,000	8,220,000
SAM RAYBURN DAM & RESERVOIR	2,398,000	2,398,000
SOMERVILLE LAKE	1,520,000	1,520,000
STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM	861,000	861,000
TEXAS CITY CHANNEL	2,000,000	2,000,000
TOWN BLUFF DAM & B.A. STEINHAGEN LAKE	739,000	739,000
TRINITY RIVER AND TRIBS - CHANNEL TO LIBERTY	---	1,000,000
WACO LAKE	1,300,000	1,300,000
WALLISVILLE LAKE - TRINITY RIVER	150,000	150,000
WHITNEY LAKE	2,655,000	2,655,000
WRIGHT PATMAN DAM & LAKE	1,239,000	1,239,000
VERMONT		
BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE	504,000	504,000
NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE	313,000	313,000
NORTH HARTLAND LAKE	324,000	324,000
TOWNSHEND LAKE	384,000	384,000
UNION VILLAGE DAM	276,000	276,000
VIRGINIA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY	1,705,000	1,705,000
CHINCOTEAGUE INLET	251,000	251,000
CHINCOTEAGUE INLET	1,191,000	1,191,000
GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW	943,000	943,000
HAMPTON ROADS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEW HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL)	180,000	180,000
HOSKINS CREEK	680,000	680,000
JAMES RIVER	1,647,000	1,647,000
JOHN H. KERR DAM & RESERVOIR, VA & NC	6,234,000	6,234,000
JOHN W. FLANNAGAN DAM & RESERVOIR	621,000	621,000
LITTLE WICOMIC RIVER	100,000	100,000
LITTLE MACHIPONGO	300,000	300,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
LYNNHAVEN INLET	665,000	665,000
NEWPORT NEWS CHANNEL	1,456,000	1,456,000
NORFOLK HARBOR	6,015,000	6,015,000
NORTH FORK OF POUND LAKE	270,000	270,000
PHILPOTT LAKE	1,351,000	1,351,000
PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS	256,000	256,000
THIMBLE SHOAL CHANNEL	665,000	665,000
WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA	1,273,000	1,273,000
YORK RIVER	100,000	100,000
WASHINGTON		
BELLINGHAM HARBOR I & J WATERWAY	45,000	45,000
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM	6,752,000	6,752,000
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK & SAND ISLAND	303,000	303,000
COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA & OR	207,000	207,000
EDIZ HOOK	1,635,000	1,635,000
GRAYS HARBOR & CHEHALIS RIVER	3,390,000	3,390,000
HOWARD A. HANSON RESERVOIR	711,000	711,000
ICE HARBOR LOCK & DAM	4,620,000	4,620,000
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL	2,993,000	2,993,000
LITTLE GOOSE LOCK & DAM, LAKE BRYAN	3,569,000	3,569,000
LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA & ID	5,375,000	5,375,000
LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK & DAM	3,998,000	3,998,000
MILL CREEK LAKE	350,000	350,000
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM	975,000	975,000
PUGET SOUND & ITS TRIBUTARY WATERS	785,000	785,000
QUILLAYUTE RIVER	2,125,000	2,125,000
SEATTLE HARBOR	490,000	490,000
STILLAGUMISH RIVER	100,000	100,000
TACOMA - PUYALLUP RIVER	50,000	50,000
THE DALLES LOCK & DAM, LAKE CELILO, WA & OR	8,191,000	8,191,000
WILLAPA RIVER & HARBOR & NASELLE RIVER	20,000	20,000
WYNOOCHEE LAKE	1,127,000	1,127,000
WEST VIRGINIA		
BEECH FORK LAKE	484,000	484,000
BLUESTONE LAKE	628,000	628,000
BURNSVILLE LAKE	704,000	704,000
EAST LYNN LAKE	737,000	737,000
ELKINS	6,000	6,000
KANAWHA RIVER	6,581,000	6,581,000
R. D. BAILEY LAKE	734,000	734,000
SUMMERSVILLE LAKE	851,000	851,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
SUTTON LAKE	1,315,000	1,315,000
TYGART RIVER LAKE	760,000	760,000
WISCONSIN		
EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE	373,000	373,000
FOX RIVER	928,000	928,000
GREEN BAY HARBOR	1,948,000	1,948,000
GREEN BAY HARBOR	672,000	672,000
KEWAUNEE HARBOR	117,000	117,000
LAFARGE LAKE	51,000	51,000
MANITOWAC HARBOR	216,000	216,000
MILWAUKEE HARBOR	1,574,000	1,574,000
RACINE HARBOR	41,000	41,000
SHEBOYGAN HARBOR (DIKED DISPOSAL)	120,000	120,000
SHEBOYGAN HARBOR	1,059,000	1,059,000
STURGEON BAY & LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL	29,000	29,000
STURGEON BAY & LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL (DIKED DISPOSAL)	130,000	130,000
TWO RIVERS HARBOR	189,000	189,000
MISCELLANEOUS		
ENVIRONMENTAL AND WATER QUALITY OPERATIONAL STUDIES	1,000,000	1,000,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS	4,789,000	5,009,000
INSPECTION OF NON-FEDERAL LEVEES	897,000	897,000
SCHEDULING FLOOD CONTROL RESERVOIR OPERATIONS	1,836,000	1,836,000
MONITOR COMPLETED COASTAL PROJECTS	900,000	900,000
RIVER ICE MANAGEMENT	3,000,000	3,000,000
REPAIR, EVALUATION, MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION RESEARCH (REMR)	7,325,000	7,325,000
MOBILIZATION PLANNING	9,900,000	9,900,000
RECREATION FACILITIES AT COMPLETED PROJECTS	10,000,000	10,050,000
COMMERCIAL STATISTICS	3,200,000	3,200,000
PROTECTION OF NAVIGATION		
REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS AND OBSTRUCTIONS	2,200,000	2,200,000
PROTECTION, CLEARING AND STRAIGHTENING CHANNELS (SECTION 3)	50,000	50,000
GENERAL REGULATORY FUNCTIONS	49,500,000	49,500,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS	7,697,000	7,697,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS.....	1,900,000	1,900,000
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE.....	---	-24,200,000
TOTAL.....	1,297,000,000	1,317,557,000

TYPE OF PROJECT:
(N) NAVIGATION
(FC) FLOOD CONTROL
(BE) BEACH EROSION CONTROL
(MP) MULTIPLE-PURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriations 1984	$103,000,000
Budget estimate, 1985	113,000,000
House allowance	113,000,000
Committee recommendation	108,150,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−4,850,000
House allowance	−4,850,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $108,150,000, which is $4,850,000 below the House allowance and budget request.

This appropriation finances the expenses of the Office, Chief of Engineers, the division offices, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and certain research and statistical functions of the Corps of Engineers.

The Committee action provides a 5-percent increase over the funding level for the current year. This recommendation is consistent with the desire to reduce the rate of increase, and encourage operational efficiencies and improved management practices.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 1984	$33,831,000
Budget estimate, 1985	35,651,000
House allowance	35,566,000
Committee recommendation	31,023,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−4,628,000
House allowance	−4,543,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $31,023,000, which is $4,628,000 below the budget request, $4,543,000 below the House allowance, and $2,808,000 below the current funding level.

Sierra cooperative pilot project, Nevada.—The Committee has provided an additional $800,000 for studies of effects of cloud seeding activities in Nevada and California.

Yakima River Basin water enhancement, fish passage, and protective facilities.—An additional amount of $500,000 is recommended for Yakima fish passage and protective facilities. The Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to use these and other available funds to accelerate and complete the advanced planning and design on the Prosser Dam, Roza Dam, and Easton Dam fish ladder and screen improvements. The Committee expects the Bureau to complete the design work in 1985 thereby permitting construction to proceed later in 1985 or in 1986 on these high priority fish enhancement projects.

HIPLEX related research.—The Committee has provided an additional $500,000 to continue the university research grant related to cloud seeding and pilot training.

Oakley Fan water supply study, Idaho.—The Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to use $50,000 of available funds for completion of a design hydrogeologic study of the Oakley Fan water supply recharge project. The Bureau is urged to work closely with the USGS in conducting this investigation.

The recommended amounts provided under this heading for surveys and activities are shown in the following table:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Type of project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
ARIZONA				
LOWER COLORADO RIVER WATER CONSV.&EFFICIENT USE PROG..	SP.INV.	180,000	180,000	180,000
CALIFORNIA				
ALL AMERICAN CANAL RELOCATION.....	PRJ.INV.	409,000	409,000	409,000
CENTRAL VALLEY:				
DELTA DIVISION, KELLOGG UNIT REFORMULATION.....	PRJ.INV.	283,000	283,000	283,000
FISH AND WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT STUDY.....	SP.INV.	444,000	444,000	444,000
NEW MELONES CONVEYANCE SYSTEM.....	PRJ.INV.-I	550,000	550,000	550,000
SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY CONVEYANCE STUDY.....	PRJ.INV.	357,000	357,000	---
IMPERIAL IRRIGATION DISTRICT CANAL LINING AND SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT.....	PRJ.INV.	150,000	150,000	150,000
LOWER COLORADO WATER SUPPLY PROJECT.....	PRJ.INV.	50,000	50,000	50,000
LOWER COLORADO WATER SUPPLY PROJECT.....	ADV.PLNG.	200,000	200,000	200,000
COLORADO				
COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON POWERPLANT.....	PRJ.INV.	50,000	50,000	50,000
CRWQIP, LOWER GUNNISON WATER SYSTEMS.....	ADV.PLNG.	500,000	500,000	500,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Type of project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
MESA-DELTA M&I GROUNDWATER STUDY.....	PRJ.INV.-M&I,P	205,000	205,000	205,000
PROGRAM RELATED ENGINEERING AND SCIENTIFIC STUDIES....		5,967,000	5,967,000	5,967,000
IDAHO				
BOISE PROJECT POWER AND MODIFICATION STUDY.....	PRJ.INV.-P	130,000	130,000	130,000
MINIDOKA PROJECT,NORTH SIDE PUMPING DIVISION EXTEN....	PRJ.INV.-I	100,000	100,000	100,000
MONTANA				
HUNGRY HORSE POWERPLANT ENLARGE.& REREGULATING RESV...	PRJ.INV.-P	135,000	135,000	135,000
MARIAS-MILK UNIT (P-SMBP).....	ADV.PLNG.	400,000	400,000	400,000
NEBRASKA				
PLATTE RIVER WATER USE OPTIONS (P-SMBP).....	SP.INV.	150,000	150,000	150,000
PRAIRIE BEND UNIT (P-SMBP).....	PRJ.INV.	255,000	255,000	255,000
NEVADA				
DEEP-CARBONATE AQUIFER.....	PRJ.INV.-P	300,000	300,000	300,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1984	$695,318,000
Budget estimate, 1985	764,137,000
House allowance	707,817,000
Committee recommendation	752,397,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−11,470,000
House allowance	+44,580,000

A new appropriation of $752,397,000 is recommended by the Committee. This is $11,470,000 below the budget request.

Garrison diversion unit, N. Dak.—The Committee has included the full budget request of $53,580,000 for continued work on the Garrison diversion unit, N. Dak. The Committee continues to recognize the value of this project and strongly supports completion of the unit. To allay concerns about the impact of the project on Canada, the Committee has included language in the bill which prohibits funding for any project features affecting waters flowing into Canada.

The Garrison diversion unit is but one part of a larger plan, the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin program, authorized by the Congress in 1944. That plan consisted of large reservoirs on the Missouri River so that downstream areas could have protection from continued devastating flooding.

A significant portion of that flood protection was provided with the construction of Garrison Dam in 1953, which took nearly 550,000 acres of prime, productive farm land out of production and placed it permanently under water. In return for permanently flooding this North Dakota farm land, the Federal Government made a commitment to North Dakota for compensation by developing similar irrigated acreage.

There are no new issues relating to the Garrison project. All environmental laws have been complied with and compliance has been upheld in the Federal courts after many years of review, and the Congress and the U.S. Government have consistently taken the position that no work will be initiated of features of the project which would adversely affect waters flowing into Canada.

It is these facts and the many hours of testimony and considerable amount of material presented in other forums which form the basis of the Committee recommendation.

Lower Colorado regional offices.—The Committee has been informed of the need to consolidate activities of the Lower Colorado regional offices of the Bureau of Reclamation. Therefore, the Bureau of Reclamation is directed to use $300,000 of available funds to develop final plans and specifications for an annex addition to the regional offices. The Committee expects follow on funding to be requested in the normal budget process.

Central Arizona project.—The Committee recommendation includes $192,260,000 for the Central Arizona Project. This is $26,500,000 over the current level of funding and $5,000,000 over the budget request for 1985.

The Committee is encouraged with Bureau of Reclamation's efforts and commitment to maintain water delivery schedules to the Phoenix and Tucson metropolitan areas. However, the Committee action in providing additional funds for 1985 is an effort to insure that, if delays are encountered, they will not be due to funding constraints. The Committee is also aware that under certain conditions additional funds could possibly be used on the project. This is not unusual for projects of this kind and the Committee directs the Bureau to reprogram additional available funds into the project when the required conditions for funding are met. The Committee intends that funds appropriated in this bill be applied to guarantee the current water delivery dates and, where possible, accelerate delivery schedules through to Tucson.

In addition, the Committee is aware that completion of a final EIS is on the critical path for Tucson aqueduct, phase B construction activities. In order to insure that the process moves along as rapidly as possible and to maintain existing water delivery schedules and prevent increases in project costs, the Bureau of Reclamation is directed to make every effort to expedite the completion and approval of the final EIS, thereby enabling early construction to begin phase B work.

Because of the sensitive nature of any project of this type constant communication and coordination by the Bureau and other Federal agencies and State and local interests should occur on a regular basis. The Committee is pleased to note that recent meetings by the Bureau with local interests have proved useful. However, should progress not continue, the Committee will insist that a special facilitator be appointed by the Bureau to coordinate activities relative to the EIS to give sufficient consideration to all environmental and other local concerns associated with the project.

The Committee wishes to acknowledge the efforts and commitment of the Department and the Secretary of the Interior in bringing forward plan 6, which provides flood control and regulatory storage for the project. The Secretary is directed to proceed with preconstruction planning for the implementation of plan 6.

WEB rural water development project, South Dakota—The Committee has provided an additional $5,000,000 to accelerate work on the WEB rural water development project and urges the Bureau of Reclamation to work with all interested parties to insure that this important project proceeds as rapidly as possible.

Included in the appropriation for the WEB project is funding required to increase the size of the portion of the WEB pipeline which will carry water to the North Dakota State line at Emmons County, N. Dak. The increased pipeline size is required to provide the North Dakota delivery at 65 gallons of water per minute. The WEB Water Development Association is hereby directed to reduce the delivery charge to the subscribers of the State Line Rural Water Cooperative in accordance with the Federal funding provided for this purpose.

O'Neill unit, Nebraska—The Committee has deleted, without prejudice, funds contained in the budget for the O'Neill unit in Nebraska.

Because of litigation, there is no present requirement for funding. The Committee wishes to emphasize its continued strong support for the O'Neill unit. The Committee directs the Bureau, using available funds, to continue to work with the State of Nebraska on the study of potential alternatives to the O'Neill unit.

Boulder Canyon project improvements, Arizona and Nevada—The bill contains $1,000,000 to begin preconstruction activity on the Boulder Canyon project improvements, Arizona and Nevada. The amount recommended along with other available funds should be sufficient to allow advanced planning work to proceed without delay.

Twin Falls Canal Co.,-Salmon Falls Division, Idaho.—The Bureau of Reclamation is directed to use $100,000 of available funds for further work in relation to the authorized Salmon Falls Division investigation of the possibility of a conjunctive program with the Twin Falls Canal Co., relating to the cooperative effort to enlarge portions of the Twin Falls Main and High Line Canals, which would permit delivery of waters to the Salmon Falls Division in the vicinity of Cottonwood Creek and other points.

Audits of major reclamation projects.—The Committee believes that the repayment of appropriated funds, properly allocated to reimbursable project purposes, should proceed in accordance with the requirements of existing law. To that end, the Committee directs the Inspector General, Department of the Interior to schedule for audit the accounts of all major reclamation projects completed or under construction in order to verify their financial status in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles, during fiscal years 1985 through 1987. The appropriation of funds needed for continuing project construction should not be misconstrued by the Bureau or by non-Federal interests to sanction any departure from the cost recovery requirements as authorized.

South Dakota water deliveries study (Garrison Extension).—Within the amount recommended for the Garrison unit, the Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to use $1,700,000 to accelerate the completion of studies to determine the potential benefits and impacts of the Garrison unit on South Dakota.

Buffalo Bill Dam modification, Wyoming—The Bureau of Reclamation may use available construction funds for preconstruction planning work on the Buffalo Bill Dam modification project.

Revised project funding requirements.—Subsequent to House action, the Committee has received information from the Bureau of Reclamation regarding revised project funding requirements for fiscal year 1985. The following chart lists those projects where reductions have been made and the reason for the reduction.

Project	Amount	Reason
Colorado River Basin Salinity Control project—Title I divisions	$4,000,000	Contract slippage on Yuma desalting plant.
Central Valley Project, Sacramento Division	1,000,000	Favorable bid on contract award.
Central Valley Project, San Felipe Division	4,000,000	Favorable bid on contract award.
Dolores project	3,000,000	Revised construction schedule.

The amounts recommended by the Committee are shown on the following table along with the budget request and House allowance:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Type of project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
NEW MEXICO				
ALAMOGORDO M&I WATER SUPPLY	PRJ.INV.	---	---	150,000
LAKE MEREDITH SALINITY CONTROL	PRJ.INV.	240,000	240,000	240,000
TAOS COMMUNTIY DITCH EVALUATION	PRJ.INV.-I	---	50,000	---
NORTH DAKOTA				
KIDDER COUNTY GROUNDWATER STUDY	SP.INV.-I	100,000	100,000	100,000
OKLAHOMA				
EAST CENTRAL OKLAHOMA WATER SUPPLY STUDY	PRJ.INV.-M&I	---	350,000	---
KIAMICHI HYDROPOWER STUDY	PRJ.INV.-P	---	350,000	---
NORTHWEST OKLAHOMA WATER STUDY	PRJ.INV.-M&I	85,000	---	285,000
SEWARD PROJECT	ADV.PLNG.	700,000	---	---
SOUTHEAST OKLAHOMA WATER SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	PRJ.INV.-M&I	250,000	250,000	150,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Type of project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
OREGON				
FARMERS IRRIGATION DISTRICT	SP.INV.	100,000	100,000	100,000
SILETZ RIVER BASIN	PRJ.INV.-M&I	215,000	215,000	215,000
UMATILLA RIVER BASIN	PRJ.INV.	100,000	100,000	100,000
SOUTH DAKOTA				
CENTRAL SOUTH DAKOTA WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM(CENDAK)	ADV.PLNG.	1,950,000	1,950,000	1,950,000
CENTRAL SOUTH DAKOTA WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM (P-SMBP)	PRJ.INV.-I	50,000	50,000	50,000
LAKE ANDES-WAGNER UNIT (P-SMBP)	ADV.PLNG.	140,000	140,000	140,000
SOUTH DAKOTA WATER DELIVERY	PRJ.INV.-I,M&I	200,000	200,000	200,000
TEXAS				
TEXAS BASIN, BEDIAS RESERVOIR	PRJ.INV.	275,000	275,000	275,000
TEXAS BASIN, TEXAS BIG SANDY	PRJ.INV.	250,000	250,000	250,000
TEXAS BASIN, COLORADO COASTAL PLAINS (FORMERLY COLUMBUS BEND M&I WATER SUPPLY STUDY)	PRJ.INV.-M&I	75,000	75,000	75,000
TEXAS BASIN, COLORADO COASTAL PLAINS	ADV.PLNG.	600,000	600,000	---
TEXAS BASIN, SAN JACINTO PROJECT	PRJ.INV.-M&I	275,000	275,000	275,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Type of project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
UTAH				
CRSP POWER PEAKING CAPACITY	PRJ.INV.-P	50,000	50,000	50,000
WASATCH FRONT TOTAL WATER MANAGEMENT	SP.INV.	350,000	350,000	350,000
WASHINGTON				
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT, YAKIMA FISH PASSAGE AND PROTECTIVE FACILITIES	ADV.PLNG.	175,000	175,000	675,000
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT	PRJ.INV.-I	900,000	900,000	900,000
WYOMING				
BLUE HOLES RESERVOIR	PRJ.INV.	420,000	420,000	420,000
CRWDIP, BIG SANDY RIVER UNIT	ADV.PLNG.	1,300,000	1,300,000	600,000
WESTSIDE IRRIGATION PROJECT	PRJ.INV.-I	25,000	25,000	25,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Type of project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
VARIOUS				
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.....	PRJ.INV.	5,635,000	5,635,000	5,375,000
GENERAL ENGINEERING AND RESEARCH:				
ATMOSPHERIC WATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM.....		5,471,000	5,471,000	6,771,000
SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS:				
ENVIRONMENTAL AND INTERAGENCY COORD. ACTIVITIES.....	SP.INV.	3,621,000	3,621,000	3,260,000
GENERAL PLANNING STUDIES.....	SP.INV.	300,000	300,000	300,000
INVESTIGATIONS OF EXISTING PROJECTS.....	SP.INV.	126,000	126,000	126,000
MINOR WORK IN CONNECTION WITH COMPLETED PROJ.INVEST.	SP.INV.	430,000	430,000	430,000
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES.....	SP.INV.	1,465,000	1,465,000	1,465,000
PAY RAISE ALLOWANCE.....		633,000	633,000	633,000
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS...		-1,670,000	-1,720,000	-5,370,000
TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS.....		35,651,000	35,566,000	31,023,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
ARIZONA					
HEADGATE ROCK HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT (BIA).....	55,800,000	---	9,100,000	---	---
CALIFORNIA					
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:					
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION.....	341,897,000	288,735,000	11,553,000	11,553,000	10,553,000
SAN LUIS UNIT.....	1,153,444,000	474,128,000	3,338,000	3,338,000	3,338,000
AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT.....	2,060,560,000	330,762,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
GRASS VALLEY CREEK DEBRIS DAM.....	9,292,000	450,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS.....	852,074,000	848,611,000	381,000	381,000	381,000
SAN FELIPE DIVISION.....	325,424,000	190,859,000	74,763,000	74,763,000	70,763,000
SANTA MARGARITA PROJECT.....	96,992,000	---	1,500,000	---	---
COLORADO					
FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT.....	486,823,000	472,775,000	7,654,000	7,654,000	7,654,000
GRAND VALLEY UNIT, TITLE II,CRBSCP.....	243,645,000	41,734,000	3,950,000	3,950,000	3,950,000
PARADOX VALLEY UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP.....	85,445,000	14,599,000	12,985,000	12,985,000	12,985,000
SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT, CLOSED BASIN DIVISION.....	77,292,000	27,934,000	16,883,000	16,883,000	16,883,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
IDAHO					
PALISADES PROJECT, PALISADES POWERPLANT ENLARGEMENT	200,000	---	200,000	---	---
NEBRASKA					
NORTH LOUP DIVISION, P-SMBP	311,950,000	115,238,000	30,497,000	30,497,000	30,497,000
O'NEILL UNIT, P-SMBP	369,550,000	7,248,000	600,000	---	---
NEVADA					
LAS VEGAS WASH UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP	113,002,000	6,810,000	3,075,000	3,075,000	3,075,000
NEW MEXICO					
BRANTLEY PROJECT	239,919,000	28,096,000	45,037,000	45,037,000	45,037,000
VELARDE COMMUNITY DITCH PROJECT	15,792,000	3,000,000	1,580,000	1,580,000	1,580,000
NORTH DAKOTA					
GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT, P-SMBP	1,134,100,000	213,370,000	53,580,000	---	53,580,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
OKLAHOMA					
MCGEE CREEK PROJECT	117,536,000	80,789,000	19,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000
SOUTH DAKOTA					
BELLE FOURCHE UNIT, P-SMBP	48,857,000	---	---	710,000	710,000
WEB RURAL WATER DEVELOPMENT PROJECT	95,206,000	7,900,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	10,000,000
TEXAS					
NUECES RIVER PROJECT	90,484,000	82,561,000	5,318,000	5,318,000	5,318,000
RIO GRANDE PROJECT, AMERICAN CANAL EXTENSION	37,637,000	450,000	950,000	950,000	950,000
WASHINGTON					
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM PROJECT, OROVILLE-TONASKET UNIT	72,105,000	48,692,000	14,780,000	14,780,000	14,780,000
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT:					
IRRIGATION FACILITIES	3,450,301,000	897,916,000	12,600,000	12,600,000	12,600,000
THIRD POWERPLANT	710,500,000	638,976,000	40,570,000	40,570,000	40,570,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
WYOMING					
BUFFALO BILL DAM MODIFICATION, P-SMBP	71,200,000	874,000	5,000,000	---	---
RIVERTON UNIT, P-SMBP	45,829,000	41,002,000	4,230,000	4,230,000	4,230,000
VARIOUS					
BOULDER CANYON PROJECT IMPROVEMENTS	99,760,000	600,000	4,600,000	2,600,000	1,000,000
MEASURES BELOW IMPERIAL DAM, TITLE I, CRBSCP	503,696,000	242,508,000	30,463,000	30,463,000	26,463,000
DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION:					
ARBUCKLE PROJECT, OKLAHOMA	4,000,000	200,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
BOISE PROJECT, ARROWROCK DIVISION, IDAHO	6,600,000	---	400,000	400,000	400,000
BOISE PROJECT, PAYETTE DIVISION, IDAHO	29,666,000	27,160,000	960,000	960,000	960,000
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK&LEVEE SYSTEM,AR.,CO.,NV.	88,466,000	1,500,000	16,500,000	16,500,000	16,500,000
EDEN PROJECT, WYOMING	14,580,000	11,384,000	650,000	650,000	650,000
GILA PROJECT, ARIZONA	78,115,000	74,583,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
KLAMATH PROJECT, OREGON-CALIFORNIA	48,930,000	36,848,000	1,589,000	1,589,000	1,589,000
LEADVILLE MINE DRAINAGE TUNNEL, COLORADO	3,213,000	2,839,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
MISCELLANEOUS ENGINEERING SERVICES, COLORADO	452,000	401,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT, OKLAHOMA	41,861,000	41,561,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
NEWLANDS PROJECT, NEVADA	20,468,000	2,743,000	1,185,000	1,185,000	1,185,000
PALMETTO BEND PROJECT, TEXAS	71,438,000	71,338,000	100,000	100,000	100,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
UNITS OR DIVISIONS, PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM:					
BOSTWICK DIVISION, NEBRASKA	57,506,000	53,288,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
CANYON FERRY UNIT, MONTANA	17,024,000	14,524,000	140,000	140,000	140,000
EAST BENCH UNIT, MONTANA	24,230,000	22,954,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
FARWELL UNIT, NEBRASKA	42,836,000	40,048,000	320,000	320,000	320,000
OAHE UNIT, SOUTH DAKOTA	490,000,000	41,938,000	90,000	90,000	90,000
OWL CREEK UNIT, WYOMING	7,010,000	6,655,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
ROBERT C.GRIFFITH WATER PROJECT, NEVADA	171,619,000	171,119,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
SAN ANGELO PROJECT, TWIN BUTTES DAM, TEXAS	32,869,000	31,727,000	1,142,000	1,142,000	1,142,000
TUALATIN PROJECT, OREGON	60,411,000	56,652,000	45,000	45,000	45,000
WASHITA BASIN PROJECT, FOSS DAM, OKLAHOMA	34,250,000	31,872,000	932,000	932,000	932,000
WASHOE PROJECT, CALIFORNIA-NEVADA	354,083,000	37,978,000	2,331,000	2,331,000	2,331,000
WEBER BASIN PROJECT, UTAH	98,198,000	94,860,000	600,000	600,000	600,000
SUBTOTAL, DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION			29,714,000	29,714,000	29,714,000
SAFETY OF DAMS PROGRAMS:					
BOISE PROJECT, BLACK CANYON DAM, IDAHO	5,780,000	538,000	600,000	600,000	600,000
COLO-BIG THOMPSON PROJECT,HORSETOOTH DAM,COLORADO	3,686,000	---	1,760,000	1,760,000	1,760,000
FRUITGROWERS DAM PROJECT, COLORADO	1,740,000	---	200,000	200,000	200,000
HEART BUTTE UNIT, HEART BUTTE DAM,N.DAKOTA(P-SMBP)	4,260,000	---	100,000	100,000	100,000
MINIDOKA PROJECT, ISLAND PARK DAM, IDAHO	7,840,000	5,990,000	1,850,000	1,850,000	1,850,000
MINIDOKA PROJECT, JACKSON LAKE DAM, WYOMING	82,000,000	3,811,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
NEWTON PROJECT, NEWTON DAM, UTAH	3,111,000	---	700,000	700,000	700,000
ORLAND PROJECT, STONY GORGE DAM, CALIFORNIA	4,829,000	3,873,000	956,000	956,000	956,000
RAPID VALLEY UNIT,PACTOLA DAM,SOUTH DAKOTA(P-SMBP)	9,700,000	---	1,550,000	1,550,000	1,550,000
SALT RIVER PROJECT, STEWART MTN. DAM, ARIZONA	9,374,000	449,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
W.C. AUSTIN PROJECT, ALTUS DAM, OKLAHOMA	2,000,000	---	700,000	700,000	700,000
DEPARTMENT DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	3,960,000	1,424,000	450,000	450,000	450,000
MODIFICATION REPORTS AND PRECONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY	26,385,000	11,885,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
SUBTOTAL, SAFETY OF DAMS			13,966,000	13,966,000	13,966,000
REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT:					
CARLSBAD PROJECT, NEW MEXICO	9,480,000	5,986,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
HARLINGEN IRRIGATION DISTRICT, TEXAS	3,000,000	400,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
MILK RIVER, GLASGOW DIVISION, MONTANA	2,200,000	110,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
OKANOGAN PROJECT, OKANOGAN IRRIGATION DISTRICT, WA	9,937,000	3,260,000	4,800,000	4,800,000	4,800,000
P-SMBP, FRENCHMAN-CAMBRIDGE DIVISION, NEBRASKA	5,500,000	5,009,000	491,000	491,000	491,000
P-SMBP, HELENA VALLEY UNIT, MONTANA	2,000,000	150,000	350,000	350,000	350,000
SALT RIVER PROJECT,ROOSEVELT WTR. CONSV. DIST.,AR	7,470,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
SHOSHONE PROJECT, HEART MOUNTAIN DIVISION, WYOMING	5,500,000	2,587,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
STRAWBERRY VALLEY PROJECT, UTAH	5,728,000	903,000	3,150,000	3,150,000	3,150,000
SUN RIVER PROJECT, FT. SHAW DIVISION, MONTANA	1,500,000	100,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
SUN RIVER PROJECT, GREENFIELDS DIVISION, MONTANA	8,300,000	7,717,000	583,000	583,000	583,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
UNCOMPAHGRE PROJECT, COLORADO.....	5,640,000	2,954,000	660,000	660,000	660,000
YAKIMA PROJECT, GRANDVIEW IRRIGATION DISTRICT, WA...	1,099,000	200,000	600,000	600,000	600,000
YAKIMA PROJECT, GRANGER IRRIGATION DISTRICT, WA.....	1,134,000	100,000	1,034,000	1,034,000	1,034,000
YAKIMA PROJECT, OUTLOOK IRRIGATION DISTRICT, WA.....	2,522,000	1,461,000	1,061,000	1,061,000	1,061,000
YAKIMA PROJECT, YAKIMA-TIETON IRRIG. DIST.,WA.....	62,133,000	40,822,000	18,300,000	18,300,000	18,300,000
SUBTOTAL, REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT OF EXISTING PROJECTS.....			34,579,000	34,579,000	34,579,000
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION AND COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS			501,446,000	430,176,000	478,156,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1984	$134,291,000
Budget estimate, 1985	149,689,000
House allowance	149,689,000
Committee recommendation	149,689,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $149,689,000, which is the same as the House allowance and budget request.

The fiscal year 1985 budget provides for operation and maintenance and associated work on 32 projects. The program also provides for the negotiation and administration of water marketing contracts; soil and moisture conservation; flood control operations at a number of water user operated reservoirs; water management and construction; and examination of existing structures.

LOAN PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1984	$45,000,000
Budget estimate, 1985	67,537,000
House allowance	72,037,000
Committee recommendation	67,537,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	−4,500,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $67,537,000. This is $4,500,000 below the House allowance, but $22,537,000 over the current year funding level.

This appropriation provides for loans to non-Federal organizations for construction and rehabilitation of distribution systems and for loans and grants to construct small irrigation projects. Work will continue on 15 projects in 1985, including 5 projects which will be completed.

The Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 was enacted for the purpose of encouraging local participation by qualified organizations in the development of small reclamation projects and to provide Federal assistance in the development of similar projects by non-Federal organizations.

In concurring with the budget request, the Committee continues its strong support for the small reclamation loan program. Since the program began in 1956, nearly $450,000,000 in loan commitments have been made by the Federal Government. To date, there has not been a single default.

The Committee is aware of several projects which are not included in the 1985 budget, but should clear the required approval process before the end of this year. After careful review, the Committee believes that sufficient resources are available to the Bureau of Reclamation to begin some of these high priority projects once the formal approval process is completed. The Committee expects the Bureau of Reclamation to identify funding sources and request approval to reprogram funds to begin these new loans once final loan approval is obtained.

While proceeding with a small number of new loans in 1985, the Committee is concerned that if the current appropriations ceiling on loan applications is not raised this important program will shortly come to an end. The program recommended by the Committee can be accomplished within the current ceiling, but the backlog of applications indicates the probability that the ceiling will be reached by the end of 1984.

In light of this problem, the Committee cautions the Bureau of Reclamation to leave sufficient room under the current ceiling to accommodate administrative, escalation, and other expenses which may be required to carry out an orderly program.

Funds provided under this heading are distributed as shown in the following table:

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT					
UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN FUND					
PARTICIPATING PROJECTS					
COLORADO					
DALLAS CREEK PROJECT	104,490,000	75,831,000	13,580,000	13,580,000	13,580,000
DOLORES PROJECT	371,324,000	179,088,000	39,123,000	39,123,000	36,123,000
UTAH					
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, BONNEVILLE UNIT	2,435,660,000	516,191,000	104,780,000	104,780,000	104,780,000
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, JENSEN UNIT	74,220,000	56,123,000	2,418,000	2,418,000	2,418,000
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, UINTAH UNIT	163,873,000	5,874,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, UPALCO UNIT	89,279,000	8,531,000	3,215,000	3,215,000	3,215,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
VARIOUS					
DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION:					
UNITS:					
MODIFICATIONS & ADDITIONS TO COMPLETED FACILITIES.	16,970,000	12,065,000	2,087,000	2,087,000	2,087,000
PARTICIPATING PROJECTS:					
SEEDSKADEE PROJECT, WYOMING.....	31,300,000	24,400,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
RECREATIONAL AND FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES:					
RECREATIONAL FACILITIES.....	176,503,000	89,690,000	5,991,000	5,991,000	5,991,000
FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES.....	188,759,000	45,551,000	1,960,000	1,960,000	1,960,000
TOTAL, COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT.....			174,454,000	174,454,000	171,454,000
COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT					
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT					
ARIZONA					
CENTRAL ARIZONA-PROJECT-WATER DEVELOPMENT (LCRBDF)....	2,729,724,000	1,261,943,000	132,550,000	146,950,000	137,550,000
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT,NON-INDIAN DISTR. SYSTEMS.....	260,615,000	14,499,000	55,050,000	55,050,000	55,050,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
VARIOUS					
PAY RAISE ALLOWANCE.....	---	---	4,029,000	4,029,000	4,029,000
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS...	---	---	-103,392,000	-102,842,000	-93,842,000
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM.....			764,137,000	707,817,000	752,397,000

LOAN PROGRAM

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
ARIZONA					
AK-CHIN FARMS-EAST	12,241,000	3,150,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000
ROOSEVELT IRRIGATION DISTRICT	10,515,000	5,883,000	4,532,000	4,532,000	4,532,000
CALIFORNIA					
COLUSA COUNTY WATER DISTRICT	8,640,000	2,500,000	5,196,000	5,196,000	5,196,000
EASTERN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT NO. 2	17,320,000	17,311,000	9,000	9,000	9,000
FALLBROOK PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT	12,065,000	5,660,000	6,405,000	6,405,000	6,405,000
GLIDE IRRIGATION DISTRICT	5,875,000	2,094,000	3,781,000	3,781,000	3,781,000
OAKDALE IRRIGATION DISTRICT	17,774,000	1,500,000	6,500,000	6,500,000	6,500,000
RAINBOW MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT	18,588,000	12,699,000	2,760,000	2,760,000	2,760,000
RAMONA MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT	18,919,000	9,107,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000
SANTA ANA WATERSHED PROJECT AUTHORITY	14,517,000	---	---	2,000,000	---
SAN BENITO CO. WATER CONSERV.& FLOOD CONTROL DIST	19,716,000	16,704,000	3,012,000	3,012,000	3,012,000
UNITED WATER CONSERVATION WATER DISTRICT	18,227,300	---	---	2,500,000	---
NEBRASKA					
CENTRAL NEBR.PUBLIC POWER & I.D.-PHELPS SYSTEM IMPROV.	10,351,000	9,853,000	498,000	498,000	498,000

LOAN PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
OREGON					
GALESVILLE PROJECT	25,000,000	4,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000
TEXAS					
HIDALGO COUNTY IRRIGATION DISTRICT NO.2,(SAN JUAN)	16,076,000	8,406,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
DELTA LAKE IRRIGATION DISTRICT	10,970,000	8,949,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
VARIOUS					
CONSTRUCTION COST INCREASES	13,905,000	1,905,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
ADMINISTRATION OF LOAN PROGRAM	11,851,000	7,323,000	807,000	807,000	807,000
PAY RAISE ALLOWANCE	---	---	37,000	37,000	37,000
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS	---	---	-4,000,000	-4,000,000	-4,000,000
TOTAL, LOAN PROGRAM			67,537,000	72,037,000	67,537,000

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1984	$53,750,000
Budget estimate, 1985	58,917,000
House allowance	58,917,000
Committee recommendation	56,350,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−2,567,000
House allowance	−2,567,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $56,350,000, which is $2,567,000 below the budget request and the House allowance.

This appropriation finances the general administrative and technical direction of the reclamation program as performed by the Department, Denver regional and other offices in the seven regions.

The Committee recommendation provides a 5-percent increase over the current year appropriations. This action is in line with the Committee's desire to reduce the rate of increase and encourage operational efficiencies and prudent management of those resources provided.

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Funds recommended in the bill provide for Department of Energy programs relating to energy supply, research, and development activities; uranium supply and enrichment activities; general science and research activities; atomic energy defense activities; departmental administration; power marketing activities; the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; and the geothermal resources development fund.

The Committee is recommending a general reduction of the fiscal year 1985 budget request under an ADP designation, to be applied as follows: Energy supply, research and development, $10,000,000; atomic energy defense activities, $7,000,000; general science, $3,000,000; and departmental administration, $2,000,000. The Department is to apply this general reduction to ADP related activities to the extent possible but not exclusively, and report to the Committee no later than January 31, 1985, on the allocation of the reductions within each appropriation.

Energy Supply, Research, and Development Activities

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1984	$1,744,989,000
Budget estimate, 1985	1,792,578,000
House allowance	1,664,914,000
Committee recommendation	1,740,633,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−51,945,000
House allowance	+75,719,000

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriations, 1984	$245,947,000
Budget estimate, 1985	249,535,000
House allowance	261,235,000
Committee recommendation	245,535,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−4,000,000
House allowance	−15,700,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,986,168,000 for energy supply, research, and development activities. The purpose of these funds is to support the development of new energy technologies and improve the efficiency of existing technologies. Included are the development and demonstration of solar energy, wind, ocean systems, biomass, geothermal, nuclear fission and fusion, electric energy systems, and energy storage. Efforts associated with basic energy sciences and environmental research are also included.

SOLAR ENERGY

Although the administration does not propose major reductions from the fiscal year 1984 level of funding for solar energy activities, the request would continue the downward trend in these programs which have been substantially curtailed over the last 4 years. As in the past, the Department's role in technology development would be focused on long-term research and development. Increased reliance is placed on private market forces and tax incentives rather than near-term demonstration and development.

The Committee agrees that the marketplace must ultimately decide the future role of the solar technologies. Most solar and renewables research, however, has not been developed to the point where the private sector alone can be expected to carry forward with its development.

The Committee considers it essential that a viable solar and renewable energy research and development program be maintained in the Department of Energy and that the staff expertise be maintained to properly manage this type of effort. Continued basic research and development of solar and renewable energy is essential to maintain a balanced energy research program.

Accordingly, the Committee recommends continuation of program funds and staffing levels to carry out this basic research activity. The Committee recommendation for solar energy is $183,049,000. This is essentially level funding from last year or $1,399,000 above the level of funding in fiscal year 1984.

Solar building systems.—The Committee recommends $11,885,000 for solar building energy research, the same as the budget request and $2,000,000 over the House allowance. The budget request for this program combines basic and applied research activities formerly carried out in the active and passive solar program. The recommendation includes $7,200,000 for materials and components research, and $4,485,000 for systems analysis and thermal science.

The Committee recognizes the importance of research on active solar cooling systems, and encourages the continuity of ongoing research in centers of expertise other than the Federal laboratories. Where such centers of expertise exist at universities or other educational institutions, the Committee recommends that a portion of research funds be made available to these centers in support of active solar energy cooling systems.

Photovoltaic energy systems.—The recommendation provides $50,500,000 in operating expenses for photovoltaic energy systems, which is $4,000,000 more than the total request, and $1,100,000 more than the fiscal year 1984 level of funding. This recommended funding will continue the highest priority requirements needed to continue progress in reducing the costs and improving the efficiencies of photovoltaic systems.

The Committee expects the Department to maintain a balanced program of advanced research, materials research, technology development, and systems development. For this purpose, the Committee added

32-250 O - 84 - 7

$4,000,000 for systems research, including module testing, array and balance of systems activities, and operation of the residential experiment stations.

For construction, the Committee continues support for the cost-shared SMUD project. An amount of $5,000,000 is included for the 5-megawatt phase III increment of this photovoltaic powerplant.

Solar thermal energy systems.—The Committee recommends $39,500,000 for solar thermal energy, $2,000,000 over the budget request and $7,000,000 more than the House allowance. The recommendation provides $9,000,000 for distributed receiver activities, which is $2,000,000 more than the request, and about $3,000,000 less than the fiscal year 1984 level of funding.

Several industry groups are actively pursuing the development of commercial-sized central receiver projects utilizing the information and experience gained from research and development efforts supported by the Government's solar thermal program. Because these private industry efforts are in the early development stages, no funding is provided at this time. However, the Committee supports and encourages these private industry efforts which may result in the eventual construction and operation of a commercial sized facility. The Committee urges the Department to structure the solar thermal program so as to support these private industry efforts.

Biofuels energy systems.—The Committee recommends $29,000,000 for the biofuels program in fiscal year 1985, a reduction of $4,100,000 below the House allowance. This amount is $900,000 over the request and $500,000 over the fiscal year 1984 funding. The recommendation adopts the structure proposed last year which combines activities in the areas of biomass, alcohol fuels, and urban waste into one budget category.

The Committee supports the Department's decision to consolidate urban waste research and development program activities within the biofuels program. However, in order to maintain urban waste program viability, the Committee specifically includes a minimum of $4,000,000 for urban waste R&D activities within the biofuels program.

Within the biofuels program, $1,000,000 is provided for the municipal solid waste R&D test program at Waltz Mill, Pa.

The Committee provides $4,000,000, the same as last year, to continue the regional biomass energy programs, similar to the successful effort at the Bonneville Power Administration. In addition to providing support for activities at BPA and TVA, the Department shall carry out programs in other regions of the country, particularly in the Midwest and Southwest region. These regional programs include activities related to technology transfer, industry support, resource assessment, and matching local resources to conversion technologies.

Wind energy systems.—The Committee recommendation includes $28,300,000 for wind energy systems, an increase of $5,000,000 over the budget request. The wind program should continue to focus research, test, and evaluation on both small and large wind systems. The Com-

mittee recommends up to a $3,000,000 reduction in the large increase in aerodynamics and structural dynamics research. The Committee provides sufficient funds for a new test bed for vertical axis machines as requested in the budget.

In the large wind machine program, the Committee believes it is important to continue the MOD–5 program in order to obtain the maximum benefits from earlier investments. Accordingly, the Committee provides an additional $8,000,000 in fiscal year 1985 funding for MOD–5 activities. In addition, the Department is directed to apply the $3,000,000 deferred in fiscal year 1984 from the MOD–5A program to the MOD–5B project.

Ocean energy systems.—The Committee provides $5,500,000 for ocean energy systems, $2,000,000 over both the House allowance and the budget request. The Committee recommends continuation of the generic and advanced research needs of the program, including up to $2,100,000 for small-scale open cycle OTEC. An amount of $1,800,000 is provided for experimental verification and testing including funds for the continuation of modifications to the Seacoast Test Facility in Hawaii. An amount of $400,000 is provided for applied research in wave power conversion systems.

Other solar programs.—The recommendation includes $12,364,000 for other solar activities, the same as the budget request. This amount includes funds for program direction and support, technology transfer activities, and the international solar energy program.

The Committee recommends that the Department increase its research into the production of hydrogen fuel through the utilization of renewable energy technologies, and, therefore, recommends an additional $500,000 for this specific purpose.

GEOTHERMAL

The geothermal research and development program is aimed at resolving technical problems that preclude the private sector from fully developing our vast geothermal resources. The Committee recommends $31,087,000 for geothermal activities, an increase of $4,000,000 over the budget request and $1,000,000 over the House allowance.

Hydrothermal industrialization.—The Committee includes $2,000,000 to continue a minimal effort in the hydrothermal area. These funds will assist States with significant hydrothermal resources to continue programs relating to resource assessment, resource development, technical assistance, and related activities.

Geopressured resources.—The recommendation includes $3,500,000 for geopressured resources, the same as the budget request and $3,000,000 below the House allowance. This funding will continue flow testing of design wells and provide analysis of long-duration flow test data from the design wells.

Geothermal technology.—The Committee recommends $24,556,000 for geothermal technology activities, $2,000,000 more than the budget request and the House allowance. An additional $2,000,000 is provided

for the continued efforts on phase II thermal loop at Fenton Hill, N. Mex.

HYDROPOWER

The Committee recommendation includes $750,000 for small-scale hydropower, the same as the fiscal year 1984 level and $303,000 over the 1985 budget request.

ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE

The Committee recommends $40,335,000 for energy storage and electric energy systems, the same as the House and $5,000,000 over the request.

Electric energy systems.—A total of $20,732,000 is provided for electric energy systems, which is $2,500,000 over the budget request and the same as the House allowance. The recommendation includes adequate funds for continued development of the Hawaiian deep-sea cable project.

Energy storage systems.—An amount of $19,603,000 is included for energy storage, an increase of $2,000,000 over the budget request. The recommendation provides $16,850,000 for battery storage which will allow for continuation of the ongoing technology development and testing, and $2,300,000 for thermal and mechanical storage and superconducting magnetic storage.

Within the funds included for energy storage systems, $1,500,000 is provided for high temperature phase change thermal storage for industrial applications.

NUCLEAR FISSION

The Committee believes that nuclear fission remains an important option for meeting our electric energy requirements and for lessening the Nation's reliance on imported oil. The Committee continues to strongly support the nuclear fission program.

A total of $626,003,000 is provided for the nuclear fission reactor program, $13,000,000 over the House and $3,000,000 above the budget request.

Converter reactor.—An amount of $88,466,000 is recommended for converter reactor activities, the same as the House and the budget request.

For high-temperature reactor technology, $34,609,000 is recommended, which is the same as the House allowance. The development of this technology has been supported in the past because of its potential to serve special market areas and its potential advantages over the current light water reactor systems. No funding is available from this account for any activities relating to the new production reactor for defense programs.

The Committee recommends that efforts be focused on modular high-temperature-gas reactor concepts, in order to develop an HTGR option that offers simplicity in design and optimizes the safety and eco-

nomic features of the plant. The scope of the effort should address critical technical and licensing issues, as well as the issue of fabrication of modularized nuclear plants. Identification of a lead laboratory such as the Oak Ridge National Laboratory could help assure that this program receives the proper coordination and direction.

For light water reactor systems and Three Mile Island activities, a total of $48,200,000 is provided, the same as the budget request. The Committee notes that the TMI program is limited to necessary research and development only. Responsibility for the costs of TMI's cleanup remains with the owner of the facility.

For advanced reactor systems, the fiscal year 1985 budget request again proposes to transfer funding for reduced enrichment research and test reactor (RERTR) program to the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The Committee considers this type of research to be a responsibility of the Department of Energy. Therefore, the funding request has been transferred from the Commerce, State, Justice and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee to the Energy and Water Development Subcommittee. The Committee recommends $4,932,000 for this activity, the same as the House and the budget request.

Nuclear waste technology.—The Committee recommends $13,305,000 for nuclear waste technology, the same as the request and the House allowance.

Civilian waste.—The recommendation includes $27,640,000 for civilian waste R&D activities, the same as requested in the budget.

Advanced nuclear systems.—The Committee recommends $33,500,000 for advanced systems and space applications, the same as the budget request.

Remedial actions.—The Committee recommends $167,010,000 for the remedial action program, a $15,000,000 increase over the budget request and the House allowance.

For the formerly utililized site program, the recommendation includes $19,000,000, which is $3,000,000 more than the budget request and the House allowance.

The Committee provides $3,000,000 in additional funding for activities at sites and vicinity properties at Colonie, N.Y., Wayne, N.J., Maywood, N.J., and Hazelwood, Mo.

The Committee directs the Department to take the necessary steps to consolidate and dispose of the waste material from the Latty Avenue site and nearby St. Louis Airport vicinity properties locally, by reacquiring, stabilizing, and using the old 21.7 acre AEC airport site in a manner acceptable to the city of St. Louis. The Committee understands that this action adopts the lowest cost option for the remedial action R&D program at these sites.

For the uranium mill tailings remedial action program, the Committee recommends $66,010,000, an increase of $12,000,000 over the budget request. This program is responsible for conducting remedial actions and cleanup at numerous inactive mill tailings sites and several associated vicinity properties as mandated by Public Law 95–604. The

budget request reflects the program's transition from the planning and environmental analysis phase to the detailed engineering and construction phase. An increased funding level is required to accelerate the priority sites and vicinity properties and to establish the momentum necessary to meet the 7-year schedule mandated by law.

The Committee recommendation includes an additional $12,000,000 over the administration's request in order to implement the agreement between the Department of Energy and the State of Utah to clean up vicinity properties and accelerate the removal of the Vitro uranium mill tailings away from Salt Lake City to a remote, more suitable site at Clive, Utah.

The Committee has received strong evidence from the Department of Energy and the State of Utah, which demonstrates that stabilization of the tailings in place will not solve the health and safety problem which exists due to the presence of the Vitro site in the center of a large metropolitan area of 670,000 people. Specifically, the Committee has been given evidence which demonstrates the Vitro pile to be highly toxic and incompatible with the acquifer underneath the tailings pile; a small stream which runs through the center of the pile and ends in the Great Salt Lake; and numerous municipal drinking water wells located within one-half mile of the Vitro site. There is very little confidence that this pile can be safely maintained under a 1,000-year design life at its present metropolitan location.

The Committee is aware that if EPA's superfund criteria were applied to this site, it would qualify in the top 10 percent in the country as a hazardous waste site. It is also aware that stabilizing the tailings in place would leave the site in violation of EPA ground water policies which provide that no hazardous wastes be disposed of above a principal drinking water aquifer. Under these requirements, the tailings would have to be moved anyway.

The Committee also strongly supports the agreement between the State of Utah and the Department which places the State as the lead agency in tailings removal. The State of Utah believes it can remove the tailings to the Clive site at a cost which would be significantly less expensive than if the project remains under Federal management. The Committee supports this project management approach and the 90 percent Federal/10 percent State cost share formula for removal of the tailings and cleanup of vicinity property.

A total of $2,389,000 is provided to eliminate delays and accelerate the schedule for activities at the processing site and vicinity properties in Lakeview, Oreg. Up to $2,000,000 of additional funding is included to accelerate remedial action at Riverton, Wyo., and Gunnison, Colo.

For the surplus facilities program, the Committee recommends $30,000,000 for remedial action of surplus contaminated Department-owned facilities from the civilian nuclear energy programs. This amount is the same as the House allowance and the budget request.

For the West Valley demonstration project, the Committee recommends $49,400,000, the same as the budget request and a $13,400,000 increase above the 1984 level of funding.

Breeder reactor systems.—A total of $311,082,000 is included for breeder reactor systems research and development activities, $13,000,000 over the House allowance. This amount does not include any funding for the termination of the Clinch River Breeder Reactor (CRBR). Total termination costs for CRBR of $171,600,000 were provided through transfer of funds from the uranium enrichment account and from other available funds within this account. Much of this funding will be obligated in this year for completion of termination activities by the end of fiscal year 1985.

The Committee is concerned that the Department is not doing an adequate job of utilizing the technological benefits derived as part of the CRBR project. In capturing these benefits it is recognized that completion of some components rather than termination would be of benefit. This is of particular concern regarding the steam generators. The Committee is also concerned that the Department is not doing an adequate job in considering the FFTF as a test bed for this technology and components. Within the termination funds available, the Secretary is directed to maximize the benefits of CRBR technology to the breeder technology program, in particular the use of FFTF as a test bed.

Within funds available for CRBR termination activities, $5,000,000 is provided for breeder nuclear fuel cycle activities.

For the liquid metal fast breeder reactor program, the Committee provides $261,080,000 to continue research and development. The Committee supports the Department's effort to refocus and consolidate the LMFBR base program. Within the necessary budget constraints, it is important that the resources available to the base program be used in the most efficient and effective manner. The Department is expected to continue to streamline the program structure in such a way as to minimize disruption of ongoing activities.

During fiscal year 1985, the Department is directed to review the entire research program and establish a balanced and sensible approach to the future of the program. The fiscal year 1986 budget of the President should contain this approach and should establish priorities for breeder research in the near and long term. The Department should be prepared during hearings on the fiscal year 1986 budget to justify this policy and should be able to identify specific projects and facility requirements at each of the national laboratories and throughout the industrial infrastructure that supports the research program.

The recommendation provides $9,000,000 for concept and requirements development activities, a reduction of $10,000,000 from the budget request and $9,000,000 above the current level. The Committee believes that this effort to identify plant concepts which could be developed by industry should be a focused effort and the scope must be limited before large new increments of funding are approved. Accordingly, the Committee directs the Department to develop and submit a detailed plan to the Committee on Appropriations before obligation of funds provided for these activities.

For nuclear fuel cycle activities, the recommendation includes $14,922,000, an increase of $3,000,000 over the budget request.

The Committee includes $3,000,000 over the budget request for thorium fuel cycle research in support of the HTGR program. The Department should, to the maximum extent possible, maintain existing and ongoing activities, such as BRET, during the time of its review of research priorities so as to maintain all options for the future of nuclear fission research.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY, AND HEALTH

The Committee recommends $37,088,000 for environment, safety, and health activities, the same as the budget request and $3,000,000 below the House allowance.

For nuclear safety activities, the requested level of $16,200,000 is provided to support the Department's efforts to strengthen nuclear safety programs.

BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

The Committee recommends $196,116,000 for biological and environmental research, $10,000,000 over the budget request and an increase of $12,166,000 above the fiscal year 1984 appropriation.

For nuclear medicine applications, the recommendation includes $20,665,000, the amount requested in the budget to carryout these highly beneficial activities.

MAGNETIC FUSION

The Committee recommends $470,137,000 for magnetic fusion, an increase of $51,000,000 above the House appropriation. This amount is $13,000,000 below the budget request. The Committee expects the Department to proceed with the upgrade of the Reversed Field Pinch Machine, ZT–40, as provided for in 1984.

According to the Department of Energy, the prime objective of the magnetic fusion program is to demonstrate scientific and engineering feasibility of fusion energy, and to provide the private sector with the basis for an assessment of the economic potential of fusion.

While the Committee fully recognizes that it will be a decade or more before a sufficient scientific base is assembled to clearly specify a fusion reactor with commercial potential, we also recognize that only consistent support will allow that point to be reached. Given the uncertainties in future energy supply, it is important to maintain steady progress toward the utilization of fusion energy. The Committee has long been supportive of the fusion program and believes it is important for the Government to maintain a long-term commitment, as long as technical progress warrants. The Committee notes the recent technical accomplishments of this program, and that the Tokamak fusion test reactor (TFTR) is scheduled to provide a demonstration of the scientific feasibility of fusion power in 1986.

The Committee is aware of the recommendation of the Energy Research Advisory Board that an ignited core experiment is the next logical step for the program. However, the Committee is concerned about the large amounts of funding given to fusion research. Therefore, we recommend that the Department delay a commitment to such an experiment until the TFTR has produced its promised target of breakeven conditions in a Deuterium-Tritium plasma. The Committee does not object to the Department using a modest amount of funds to define the next program step and related activities. In selecting the best line of approach, careful consideration should be given to minimizing project costs consistent with the performance of definitive tests on all the remaining physics of a fusion reactor core. It is our intention that the Department and Office of Fusion Energy have sufficient flexibility within the resources provided to continue to plan and focus on future steps needed in the fusion program.

The Department has testified that the United States should seek to maintain its position in the forefront of international fusion research, but should also seek to raise the level of international collaboration. The Committee agrees that increased collaboration will be helpful in reducing project risk, and perhaps minimizing program costs, particularly in the area of nuclear technology development. As a first step, the Committee recommends that the opportunity to collaborate in an ignited core experiment should be extended to foreign participants.

Finally, the Department, as required by law, submitted a comprehensive program management plan to Congress in fiscal year 1983. However, the ERAB completed a review of the magnetic fusion program in January 1984, which recommended major changes in that plan. The Committee, therefore, directs the Secretary of Energy to submit a new, revised plan, taking into account the views of the ERAB, as well as including projected dates and cost estimates for achieving the Department goals in magnetic fusion. In preparing a new program management plan the Secretary should avoid sacrificing vital program elements which hold promise for achieving the overall goal of producing economic electric power production in order to construct such projects as TFCX.

A fusion power concept based on compact, high magnetic field tokamaks, using water cooled, high strength, copper alloy magnets has been brought to the attention of the Committee. A cooperative industry-Government program for the fabrication and testing of the critical components needed for a compact tokamak fusion and burn experiment has been proposed to advance the concept. The Department is to consider and advise the Committee of the feasibility of compact tokamaks designs and its views on the proposed cooperative program. If the Department determines that the concept should be pursued during fiscal year 1985, such resources as required from within this appropriation may be allocated upon submission of a report to the Committee.

SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS

The budget request proposes $479,580,000 for supporting research and technical analysis including basic energy sciences. The Committee provides $467,880,000 for these activities, an increase of $71,771,000 over the current year and $11,700,000 below the budget request.

Basic energy sciences.—A total of $411,830,000 is recommended for these activities, an increase of $74,560,000 above the current year and $125,147,000 over the prior year funding of fiscal year 1983. The recommendation is $7,700,000 below the budget request and represents some slowing of the significant growth in basic research activities.

The Committee is concerned about the ability of the United States to maintain a leadership position in scientific and engineering technology worldwide. Maintaining our technological lead is largely dependent upon the degree to which the Federal Government pursues advanced engineering research activities. For this reason, the Committee recommends an additional $6,000,000 for the engineering research program, to provide an enhanced engineering data base and advanced methodologies for application in emerging energy and industrial technologies. The program should emphasize collaborative research efforts between universities and national laboratories, and should encourage industry involvement where practicable.

Within available funding, $1,000,000 shall be used for materials processing research. The goal of this research is the development of revolutionary advances in materials processing technology, in order to improve the economics and capabilities of the U.S. materials processing industry. Research initiatives—such as plasma techniques for refining and synthesizing materials, and development of novel nondestructive examination, diagnostic, and analytical techniques—are needed to regain a U.S. competitive advantage over foreign processors.

Under applied mathematical sciences, the recommendation includes $2,000,000 for the establishment of a grant program to encourage the development of innovative programs for the transfer of technology to industry and for expanding the contact between the private sector and universities in the use of supercomputers.

The Committee directs the Department to provide a $2,300,000 grant from operating expenses for design and related activities for a science facility at the University of Oregon under authority of Public Law 93–438. The university advanced science and technology program will be housed in the facility and will include: Chemical physics, materials science, computer science, high-energy physics, geothermal energy research, laser technology, and biotechnology. Each of the programs focuses on areas where there are crucial interactions of technological and scientific importance, shared equipment, and jointly funded Federal research programs. The facility will also be used by the Advanced Science and Technology Institute, an organization which encompasses the basic science research programs and makes such research accessible to the industrial sector. The institute is a cooperative enterprise with Oregon State University. This grant is authorized by and meets the condi-

tions of section 111(b)(1)(B) of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, as amended. The additional reporting requirements of section 111(b)(2) for the facility are not applicable.

The Committee includes $3,000,000 for the second year of funding for construction of the Vitreous State Laboratory and the Center for Chemical Research.

Project 84-ER-112, the Center for Advanced Materials, the Committee includes $10,790,000, the same as the House allowance and the budget request. The Committee believes that establishment of a center for materials research at the University of California with a strong technology focus and industry participation offers the potential for significant advances in this important field.

Multiprogram facilities.—Project 80-ES-11, Idaho laboratory facility, the Committee provides $1,500,000 for design of the engineering-research laboratory wing of the Idaho laboratory facility. This facility will accommodate larger-scale engineering research activities that will provide the scientific bases for successful application of new energy technologies and advanced industrial processes.

University research support.—The Committee shares the House concern over the continued use of highly-enriched uranium at university research reactors. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission is developing a proposed rule for converting these reactors to low-enriched uranium. The recommendation includes $2,000,000 to initiate this process. The Department is directed to report to the Committees on Appropriations by January 31, 1985, on this situation and include proposals to further address it in the fiscal year 1986 budget.

The Committee recognizes that support for research programs in computational, physical, and material sciences at minority graduate universities is important. The Committee recommends that the Department provide appropriate assistance to Atlanta University and other such institutions in the development of its graduate science and technology research center.

The following tabulation shows the Committee's recommendation by program for new budget authority in comparison with the current year, the budget estimate, and the House allowance:

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT				
SOLAR ENERGY				
I. Solar applications				
A. Solar building energy systems				
Operating expenses	16,450,000	11,685,000	9,685,000	11,685,000
Capital equipment	---	200,000	200,000	200,000
Subtotal, Solar building energy systems	16,450,000	11,885,000	9,885,000	11,885,000
B. Photovoltaic energy systems				
Operating expenses	48,900,000	46,500,000	46,500,000	50,500,000
Capital equipment	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Construction - (84-CE-001)	1,500,000	---	9,500,000	5,000,000
Subtotal, Photovoltaic energy systems	50,400,000	47,500,000	57,000,000	56,500,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Solar thermal energy systems				
Operating expenses	36,750,000	37,000,000	32,000,000	39,000,000
Capital equipment	7,100,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
Subtotal, Solar thermal energy system	43,850,000	37,500,000	32,500,000	39,500,000
D. Biofuels energy systems				
Operating expenses	28,400,000	27,100,000	32,100,000	28,000,000
Capital equipment	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Subtotal, Biofuels energy systems	28,400,000	28,100,000	33,100,000	29,000,000
E. Wind energy systems				
Operating expenses	26,500,000	18,900,000	13,300,000	15,900,000
MOD-5 Wind turbine	---	4,200,000	13,000,000	12,200,000
Capital equipment	---	200,000	200,000	200,000
Subtotal, Wind energy systems	26,500,000	23,300,000	26,500,000	28,300,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
F. Ocean energy systems				
Operating expenses	5,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	5,500,000
Subtotal, Solar applications	171,100,000	151,785,000	162,485,000	170,685,000
(Operating expenses)	(162,500,000)	(148,885,000)	(150,085,000)	(162,785,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(8,600,000)	(2,900,000)	(12,400,000)	(7,900,000)
(Construction)	---	---	---	---
II. Other solar energy				
A. International solar energy program - OE	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
B. Solar technology transfer - OE	3,250,000	6,000,000	5,000,000	6,000,000
F. Program support - OE	800,000	500,000	1,000,000	1,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
G. Program direction - DE	6,000,000	4,864,000	5,500,000	4,864,000
Subtotal, Other solar energy	10,550,000	11,864,000	12,000,000	12,364,000
TOTAL, SOLAR ENERGY	181,650,000	163,649,000	174,485,000	183,049,000
(Operating expenses)	(173,050,000)	(160,749,000)	(162,085,000)	(175,149,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(8,600,000)	(2,900,000)	(12,400,000)	(7,900,000)
(Construction)	---	---	---	---
GEOTHERMAL				
I. Hydrothermal industrialization				
Operating expenses	2,000,000	---	---	2,000,000
Construction:				
80-G-2 Second 50 MWE demo plant, unknown site	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Hydrothermal industrialization	2,000,000	---	---	2,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
II. Geopressured resources				
Operating expenses	5,000,000	3,500,000	6,500,000	3,500,000
III. Geothermal technology development				
Operating expenses	22,459,000	22,156,000	22,156,000	24,156,000
Capital equipment	---	400,000	400,000	400,000
Subtotal, Geothermal technology development	22,459,000	22,556,000	22,556,000	24,556,000
V. Program direction - OE	1,000,000	1,031,000	1,031,000	1,031,000
TOTAL, GEOTHERMAL	30,459,000	27,087,000	30,087,000	31,087,000
(Operating expenses)	(30,459,000)	(26,687,000)	(29,687,000)	(30,687,000)
(Plant and Capital)	---	(400,000)	(400,000)	(400,000)
(Construction)	---	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
HYDROPOWER				
I. Small scale hydropower development - OE.....	500,000	375,000	375,000	500,000
III. Program direction - OE.....	250,000	72,000	72,000	250,000
TOTAL, HYDROPOWER.....	750,000	447,000	447,000	750,000
ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE				
I. Electric energy systems				
A. Electric field effects research				
Operating expenses.....	3,000,000	3,700,000	4,700,000	4,700,000
B. Reliability research				
Operating expenses.....	3,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. System technology				
Operating expenses	11,500,000	9,300,000	10,800,000	10,800,000
Capital equipment	---	300,000	300,000	300,000
Subtotal, System technology	11,500,000	9,600,000	11,100,000	11,100,000
D. Program direction - OE	500,000	432,000	432,000	432,000
Subtotal,Electric energy systems	18,500,000	18,232,000	20,732,000	20,732,000
II. Energy Storage Systems				
A. Battery storage				
Operating expenses	18,000,000	14,850,000	16,350,000	16,350,000
Capital equipment	---	500,000	500,000	500,000
Subtotal, Battery storage	18,000,000	15,350,000	16,850,000	16,850,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
B. Thermal and mechanical storage				
Operating expenses	7,000,000	1,300,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
C. Program direction - OE	700,000	453,000	453,000	453,000
Subtotal, Energy storage systems	25,700,000	17,103,000	19,603,000	19,603,000
TOTAL, ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE	44,200,000	35,335,000	40,335,000	40,335,000
(Operating expenses)	(44,200,000)	(34,535,000)	(39,535,000)	(39,535,000)
(Plant and Capital)	---	(800,000)	(800,000)	(800,000)
NUCLEAR				
I. Converter reactor				
A. High temperature reactor technology				
Operating expenses	30,000,000	33,109,000	33,109,000	33,109,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Capital equipment	---	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Subtotal, High temperature reactor technology	30,000,000	34,609,000	34,609,000	34,609,000
B. Light water reactor systems				
Operating expenses	19,500,000	16,000,000	20,000,000	16,000,000
C. Three Mile Island activities				
Operating expenses	33,000,000	30,700,000	30,700,000	30,700,000
Capital equipment	4,000,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Subtotal, Three Mile Island activities	37,000,000	32,200,000	32,200,000	32,200,000
D. Advanced reactor systems				
Operating expenses	4,980,000	4,932,000	4,932,000	4,932,000
Capital equipment	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Advanced reactor systems	4,980,000	4,932,000	4,932,000	4,932,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
E. Program direction - OE	1,190,000	725,000	725,000	725,000
Subtotal, Converter reactor	92,670,000	88,466,000	92,466,000	88,466,000
II. Nuclear waste technology				
1. Low level waste				
Operating expenses	7,840,000	6,365,000	6,365,000	6,365,000
Capital equipment	360,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Subtotal, Low level waste	8,200,000	6,515,000	6,515,000	6,515,000
2. Waste treatment technology				
Operating expenses	5,600,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
Capital equipment	---	300,000	300,000	300,000
Subtotal, Waste treatment technology	5,600,000	6,300,000	6,300,000	6,300,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
4. Program direction - OE	480,000	490,000	490,000	490,000
Subtotal, Nuclear waste technology	14,280,000	13,305,000	13,305,000	13,305,000
III. Civilian waste R&D				
A. Spent Fuel Storage R & D				
Operating expenses	4,500,000	12,200,000	12,200,000	12,200,000
Capital equipment	500,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Subtotal, Spent fuel storage R & D	5,000,000	13,200,000	13,200,000	13,200,000
B. Alternative disposal concepts				
Operating expenses	4,700,000	10,500,000	10,500,000	10,500,000
Capital equipment	---	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Subtotal, Alternative disposal concepts	4,700,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Generic methods & supporting studies				
Operating expenses	1,600,000	2,174,000	2,174,000	2,174,000
D. Program direction	130,000	266,000	266,000	266,000
Subtotal, Civilian waste R&D	11,430,000	27,640,000	27,640,000	27,640,000
V. Advanced nuclear systems				
A. Space and special applications				
Operating expenses	25,335,000	25,750,000	30,550,000	25,750,000
Capital equipment	2,400,000	2,200,000	2,200,000	2,200,000
Subtotal, Space and special applications	27,735,000	27,950,000	32,750,000	27,950,000
B. Advanced systems evaluations				
Operating expenses	4,800,000	4,300,000	4,300,000	4,300,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Capital equipment	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Subtotal, Advanced systems evaluations	5,000,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
C. Program direction - OE	1,370,000	1,050,000	1,050,000	1,050,000
Subtotal, Advanced nuclear systems	34,105,000	33,500,000	38,300,000	33,500,000
VI. Breeder reactor systems				
A. Liquid metal fast breeder reactor				
Operating expenses	263,600,000	236,905,000	226,905,000	236,905,000
Capital equipment	21,100,000	16,375,000	16,375,000	16,375,000
Construction:				
85-N-600 General plant projects	1,000,000	5,700,000	5,700,000	5,700,000
85-N-601 Mods to reactors, var. loc	4,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
85-N-602 ANAL, INEL, ID, security upgrades	---	500,000	500,000	500,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
83-N-334 Safeguards & sec. Assess, imp., ANL,INEL,Id.....	1,000,000	600,000	600,000	600,000
78-6-C Safety research experimental facility, INEL, Idaho (A-E, Long-lead procurement and limited construction only).....	1,100,000	---	---	---
78-6-E Liquid metal engineering center modifications, liquid metal engineering center, Santa Susana, California (A-E and long-lead procurement only).....	5,000,000	---	---	---
78-6-F Fuels & materials examination facility, richland, WA.....	4,000,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction.....	16,100,000	7,800,000	7,800,000	7,800,000
Subtotal, Liquid metal fast breeder reactor.....	300,800,000	261,080,000	251,080,000	261,080,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
B. Clinch River Breeder Reactor demonstration-OE.	40,000,000	---	---	---
C. Water cooled breeder reactor				
Operating expenses	35,500,000	26,300,000	26,300,000	26,300,000
Capital equipment	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Water cooled breeder reactor	35,500,000	26,300,000	26,300,000	26,300,000
E. Nuclear fuel cycle				
1. Fuel cycle R&D				
Operating expenses	31,385,000	10,922,000	10,922,000	13,922,000
Capital equipment	4,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Subtotal, Fuel cycle R&D	35,385,000	11,922,000	11,922,000	14,922,000
2. Program direction - OE	1,292,000	495,000	495,000	495,000
Subtotal, Nuclear fuel cycle	36,677,000	12,417,000	12,417,000	15,417,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
F. Program direction - OE	10,200,000	8,285,000	8,285,000	8,285,000
Subtotal, Breeder reactor systems	423,177,000	308,082,000	298,082,000	311,082,000
VII. Remedial action				
1. Management of surplus radioactivity contaminated DOE facilities				
Operating expenses	15,360,000	29,880,000	29,880,000	29,880,000
Capital equipment	140,000	120,000	120,000	120,000
Subtotal, Management of surplus radioactivity contaminated DOE facilities	15,500,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000
2. Formerly utilized sites remedial action program				
Operating expenses	16,700,000	15,800,000	15,800,000	18,800,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Capital equipment	300,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Subtotal, Formerly utilized sites remedial action program	17,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	19,000,000
3. Grand Junction remedial action OE	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
4. Uranium program mill tailings remedial action program				
Operating expenses	27,125,000	53,760,000	53,760,000	65,760,000
Capital equipment	775,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
Subtotal, Uranium program mill tailings remedial action program	27,900,000	54,010,000	54,010,000	66,010,000
5. West Valley				
Operating expenses	36,000,000	49,400,000	49,400,000	49,400,000
Capital equipment	---	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Construction:				
83-N-327 West Valley demo. project West Valley, N.Y.	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, West Valley	36,000,000	49,400,000	49,400,000	49,400,000
6. Program direction - OE	1,085,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
Subtotal, Remedial action	98,985,000	152,010,000	152,010,000	167,010,000
General reduction	---	---	-8,800,000	-15,000,000
TOTAL, NUCLEAR	674,647,000	623,003,000	613,003,000	626,003,000
(Operating expenses)	(624,772,000)	(588,908,000)	(578,908,000)	(591,908,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(49,875,000)	(34,095,000)	(34,095,000)	(34,095,000)
(Construction)	---	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH				
I. Environment, safety and health				
Operating expenses	30,505,000	35,588,000	38,588,000	35,588,000
Capital equipment	1,600,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Total, Environment safety and health	32,105,000	37,088,000	40,088,000	37,088,000
ENVIRONMENT R & D				
I. Biological and Environment Research				
Operating expenses	169,650,000	174,641,000	171,641,000	181,641,000
Capital equipment	8,300,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000
Construction:				
85-R-800 GPP	2,400,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Subtotal, Biological and environ. research	180,350,000	185,641,000	182,641,000	192,641,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
II. Program direction - OE.....				
A. Bio and env. research - PD.....	3,600,000	3,475,000	3,475,000	3,475,000
Total, Environment R & D.....	183,950,000	189,116,000	186,116,000	196,116,000
(Operating expenses).....	(173,250,000)	(178,116,000)	(175,116,000)	(185,116,000)
(Plant and Capital).....	(10,700,000)	(11,000,000)	(11,000,000)	(11,000,000)
(Construction).....	---	---	---	---
LIQUIFIED GASEOUS SPILL TEST FACILITY				
I. Spill test facility				
Operating expenses.....	2,250,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Construction.....	1,000,000	---	---	---
Total, Spill test facility.....	3,250,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
FUSION				
I. Magnetic fusion				
A. Confinement systems				
Operating expenses	188,050,000	196,225,000	196,225,000	196,225,000
Capital equipment	20,650,000	17,600,000	17,600,000	17,600,000
Construction:				
80-MF-3 EBT Proof of principal exp	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Confinement systems	208,700,000	213,825,000	213,825,000	213,825,000
B. Development and technology				
Operating expenses	78,310,000	79,600,000	79,600,000	79,600,000
Capital equipment	7,740,000	7,100,000	7,100,000	7,100,000
Subtotal, Development and technology	86,050,000	86,700,000	86,700,000	86,700,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Applied plasma physics				
Operating expenses	76,790,000	84,463,000	84,463,000	84,463,000
Capital equipment	5,060,000	4,900,000	4,900,000	4,900,000
Subtotal, Applied plasma physics	81,850,000	89,363,000	89,363,000	89,363,000
D. Planning and projects				
Operating expenses	48,700,000	52,800,000	52,800,000	52,800,000
Capital equipment	4,350,000	3,800,000	3,800,000	3,800,000
Construction:				
85-GPP	6,500,000	9,400,000	9,400,000	9,400,000
78-3-A Mirror fusion test facility	30,000,000	20,100,000	20,100,000	20,100,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
78-3-B Fusion materials irradiation test facility, Hanford engineering lab,WA.....	---	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Subtotal, Construction.....	36,500,000	32,500,000	32,500,000	32,500,000
Subtotal, Planning and projects.....	89,550,000	89,100,000	89,100,000	89,100,000
F. Program direction - OE.....	4,600,000	4,150,000	4,150,000	4,150,000
G. General reduction.....	---	---	-64,000,000	-13,000,000
Total, Fusion.....	470,750,000	483,138,000	419,138,000	470,138,000
(Operating expenses).....	(396,450,000)	(417,238,000)	(353,238,000)	(404,238,000)
(Plant and Capital).....	(74,300,000)	(65,900,000)	(65,900,000)	(65,900,000)
(Construction).....	---	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS				
I. Basic energy sciences				
A. Nuclear sciences				
Operating expenses	37,900,000	49,755,000	49,755,000	40,755,000
Capital equipment	2,150,000	2,950,000	2,950,000	2,950,000
Construction:				
85-ER-401 AIP	270,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
Subtotal, Nuclear sciences	40,320,000	53,005,000	53,005,000	44,005,000
B. Materials sciences				
Operating expenses	125,110,000	141,480,000	141,480,000	134,480,000
Capital equipment	12,780,000	15,450,000	15,450,000	15,450,000
Construction:				
85-ER-401	---	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
84-ER-111 N S L S	2,500,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
84-ER-112 Center for advanced material	1,760,000	10,790,000	10,790,000	10,790,000
84-ER-113 SSRL enhancement	1,240,000	9,130,000	9,130,000	9,130,000
84-ER-114 Vitreous state laboratory	5,000,000	---	9,200,000	3,000,000
84-ER-115 Natl center for chemical research	5,000,000	---	3,000,000	3,000,000
84-ER-141 A I P	640,000	---	---	---
84-EK-142 General plant projects	300,000	---	---	---
83-E-301 Improvs. to weapons Neutron ras. fac., LASL, N.M.	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	16,440,000	31,720,000	43,920,000	37,720,000
Subtotal, Materials sciences	154,330,000	188,650,000	200,850,000	187,650,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Chemical sciences				
Operating expenses	75,500,000	80,930,000	80,930,000	80,230,000
Capital equipment	6,520,000	8,840,000	8,840,000	8,840,000
Construction:				
85-ER-AIP	350,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
85-ER-400 GPP	---	5,750,000	5,750,000	3,750,000
85-ER-403 Kansas State Univ	---	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
84-ER-142 General plant projects	100,000	---	---	---
83-E-302	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	450,000	8,050,000	8,050,000	6,050,000
Subtotal, Chemical sciences	82,470,000	97,820,000	97,820,000	95,120,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
D. Applied mathematical sciences				
Operating expenses	14,670,000	28,250,000	35,250,000	27,250,000
Capital equipment	970,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Subtotal, Applied mathematical sciences	15,640,000	29,750,000	36,750,000	28,750,000
E. Engineering, mathematical, and geosciences				
Operating expenses	19,000,000	20,795,000	20,795,000	26,795,000
Capital equipment	1,150,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Subtotal, Engineering, math., and geosciences	20,150,000	22,295,000	22,295,000	28,295,000
F. Advanced energy projects				
Operating expenses	9,100,000	10,810,000	10,810,000	10,810,000
Capital equipment	310,000	320,000	320,000	320,000
Subtotal, Advanced energy projects	9,410,000	11,130,000	11,130,000	11,130,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
G. Biological energy research				
Operating expenses	10,580,000	12,490,000	12,490,000	12,490,000
Capital equipment	400,000	560,000	560,000	560,000
Subtotal, Biological energy research	10,980,000	13,050,000	13,050,000	13,050,000
H. Program direction - OE	3,970,000	3,830,000	3,830,000	3,830,000
Subtotal, Basic energy sciences	337,270,000	419,530,000	438,730,000	411,830,000
(Operating expenses)	(295,830,000)	(348,340,000)	(355,340,000)	(336,640,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(41,440,000)	(71,190,000)	(83,390,000)	(75,190,000)
(Construction)	---	---	---	---
II. Energy oversight, research analy. & Univ support				
A. Energy research analysis - OE				
1. Assessment projects	2,869,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
B. University research support - OE				
2. University reactor fuel assistance.....	1,500,000	1,900,000	1,900,000	3,900,000
3. University laboratory coop. program.....	3,500,000	6,550,000	6,550,000	6,550,000
5. Energy manpower assessment program.....	270,000	450,000	450,000	450,000
6. Education and training.....	200,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
Subtotal, University research support - OE.....	5,470,000	9,200,000	9,200,000	11,200,000
C. Advisory and oversight - OE.....	3,400,000	2,900,000	2,900,000	2,900,000
D. University research instrumentation.....	4,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	5,000,000
Subtotal, Energy oversight, res analy, & Univ sup	15,739,000	21,100,000	21,100,000	22,100,000
III. Multi-program facilities				
Construction:				
85-R-701 Central chilled water facility (BNL)	---	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
85-R-702 Replace laboratory roofs (ANL).....	---	3,508,000	3,508,000	3,508,000
85-R-703 Electrical dist. system restoration	---	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
85-R-704 Rehabilitate underground steam syste	---	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
85-R-706 Medical facility (LLNL).....	---	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
85-R-707 Hanford site fire alarm system upgra	---	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
85-R-709 Central chilled water plant (ANL)...	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
85-R-711 Upgrade envir. monitoring system (OR	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
85-R-712 Central chilled water system restor	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
84-ER-101 Rehab. old utilities (LBL).....	1,000,000	3,750,000	3,750,000	3,750,000
84-ER-102 Cooling water facility, Restor. (ORNL).....	600,000	3,400,000	3,400,000	3,400,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
84-ER-103 Road repair (various locations)....	3,000,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
84-ER-104 Facilities support Projects (various locations).....	4,000,000	---	---	---
83-E-308 Rep power sys,INEL,LLNL,ORNL,RL.....	7,988,000	2,842,000	2,842,000	2,842,000
83-E-309 Electronics fac., ANL.....	4,150,000	3,150,000	3,150,000	3,150,000
83-E-310 Utility replacements.....	7,500,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000
83-E-311 Emergency response center, ORNL.....	2,200,000	---	---	---
82-E-301 300 area utilities (HEDL).....	4,400,000	---	---	---
82-E-302 Security facility (ANL).....	2,300,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
82-E-305 Traffic safety improvements (HEDL)..	800,000	---	---	---
81-E-309 Rehab of gen pur plant (ANL).....	---	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
81-E-310 Trans & distr system upgrade (RL)...	---	---	---	---
81-E-317 Roof replacement (INEL).....	---	---	---	---
81-E-318 Upgrade primary substation (ORNL) ..	---	---	---	---
81-E-321 Site utilities project (LLL)	---	---	---	---
81-E-322 Scoville substation dist sys (INEL).	---	---	---	---
81-E-323 Fire safety improvements (ANL)	---	---	---	---
81-E-325 Energy Technology Lab (Sandia).....	3,100,000	---	---	---
80-ES-11 Idaho Lab Facility (INEL).....	1,062,000	---	---	1,500,000
General reduction.....	---	---	-5,000,000	-6,500,000
Subtotal, Multi-program facilities.....	42,100,000	38,950,000	33,950,000	33,950,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
IV. Small business innovation research progra.....	---	---	---	---
Total, Supporting research and tech. analysis....	395,109,000	479,580,000	493,780,000	467,880,000
(Operating expenses).....	(311,569,000)	(369,440,000)	(376,440,000)	(358,740,000)
(Plant and Capital).....	(83,540,000)	(110,140,000)	(117,340,000)	(109,140,000)
(Construction).....	---	---	---	---
POLICY AND MANAGEMENT				
I. Policy and Management				
A. Policy and management - OE - ER.....	1,288,000	530,000	530,000	530,000
B. Policy and management - OE - NE.....	1,868,000	1,523,000	1,523,000	1,523,000
C. Policy and management - OE - EP.....	1,611,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
D. Policy and management - CRE.....	1,567,000	1,527,000	1,527,000	1,527,000
Subtotal, Policy and management.....	6,334,000	4,580,000	4,580,000	4,580,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ENERGY APPLICATIONS				
Technical Information & Management Program				
Operating expenses	15,200,000	14,642,000	14,642,000	12,642,000
Capital equipment	800,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
Subtotal, Technical Information & Management Prog	16,000,000	15,442,000	15,442,000	13,442,000
II. In-house energy management				
Operating expenses	1,200,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Construction:				
85-A-601 Mods for energy mgmt, various loc	11,500,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
85-A-602 Fuel storage facility, BNL	1,332,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
85-A-604 Combustion air preheaters, energy te	---	3,300,000	3,300,000	3,300,000
85-A-606 Cogeneration facility, BNL	---	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
82-A-603 LASL Hot water distribution.....	1,700,000	4,700,000	4,700,000	4,700,000
General reduction.....	---	---	-5,000,000	-8,000,000
Subtotal, Construction.....	14,532,000	22,000,000	17,000,000	14,000,000
Subtotal, In-house energy management.....	15,732,000	24,000,000	19,000,000	16,000,000
(Operating expenses).....	(1,200,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)
(Construction).....	---	---	---	---
III. Plant engineering and design				
Construction:				
82-C-601 Plant engineering and design.....	1,000,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Energy applications.....	32,732,000	39,442,000	34,442,000	29,442,000
(Operating expenses).....	(16,400,000)	(16,642,000)	(16,642,000)	(14,642,000)

URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES

PROGRAM COSTS

Appropriations, 1984	$2,193,810,000
Budget estimate, 1985	1,675,300,000
House allowance	1,650,300,000
Committee recommendation	1,675,300,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	+25,000,000

GROSS REVENUES

Appropriations, 1984	$2,105,000,000
Budget estimate, 1985	1,675,300,000
House allowance	1,650,300,000
Committee recommendation	1,675,300,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	+25,000,000

This appropriation provides for expenses of the Department of Energy in connection with operating expenses, construction and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other related incidental expenses necessary for uranium supply and enrichment activities. In this account, the revenues received from the enrichment of uranium are retained and used to offset costs incurred by the Department in providing uranium enrichment and other services.

The 1985 budget request represents an effort to reexamine and institute significant changes in the uranium enrichment program. These changes were an outgrowth of the large worldwide enrichment capacity combined with lowered market demands, growing excess inventories of enriched uranium, and increasing price competitiveness of other supplies.

In response to current world market conditions, the Department proposes a new strategy which includes issuing a new contract to customers, offering more attractive pricing, taking steps to improve customer relations, and allowing the market response to the new contract to drive decisions on investments for new capacity and research and development.

The Committee has been critical of the uranium enrichment program in the past and believes a restructured effort is clearly justified and necessary.

The Committee recommends $1,675,300,000 for uranium supply and enrichment activities, the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

Gaseous diffusion program.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,171,300,000 for gaseous diffusion, the same as the budget request and $180,000,000 below the current year level. At present, the Department enriches uranium for its domestic and foreign customers at three gaseous diffusion enrichment plants. The Department recently completed a 10-year, $1,500,000,000 program to improve efficiency at

32-250 O - 84 - 10

the existing plants, and to increase their production capacity to meet potential future demand. In recent years, the plants have been operating at only about 35 percent of capacity while adequately providing for all domestic and foreign requirements.

Due to the low level of operations and to the long-term power contracts, the Department is obligated to pay capacity charges for power which is not delivered or used. The Committee again notes with concern the inclusion of a large amount, $339,000,000, in the 1985 budget request for demand payments for power under the contracts with three power suppliers which is not being used. Although the Department has obtained relief in capacity charges from two power suppliers, the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), as in previous years, has not agreed to contract demand reductions. Because of an excess in generating capacity and restrictions on marketing power outside the service area, TVA has not been willing to reduce its capacity charges and resolve this important problem. The Committee urges the Department to continue its efforts to obtain some relief from these ever increasing capacity charges.

Gas centrifuge enrichment plant.—The Committee recommends $350,000,000 for operations and support for the gas centrifuge enrichment plant (GCEP). The total amount for these activities is the same as the budget request and $230,500,000 below the fiscal year 1984 level.

Project 76–8–G, enriched uranium production facilities (GCEP), Portsmouth, Ohio, the Committee recommends $310,000,000 for construction activities, the same as the budget request and $236,000,000 below the current year funding.

The design of GCEP was initiated in fiscal year 1976 and construction began in fiscal year 1979. The original design calls for eight process buildings with an expected cost of at least $7,000,000,000 (in 1983 dollars). At the end of fiscal year 1983, DOE spent approximately $1,771,000,000 on design and construction of the plant. Most of these funds have been spent on (1) partial construction of two of the eight planned centrifuge machine process buildings, (2) partial or complete construction of many other facilities which will support the entire plant of all eight buildings, and (3) site preparation for all eight process buildings.

When Congress authorized construction of GCEP in 1975, demand for U.S. enrichment services was expected to exceed the increased capacity of improved gaseous diffusion plants by the early 1980's. With the dramatic decline in projections for nuclear powerplants, it appears clear that there is sufficient U.S. enrichment capacity without GCEP to satisfy projected demand for enrichment services through the year 2000 or beyond. There is also a worldwide surplus of uranium enrichment capacity. As noted earlier, the existing three diffusion plants are operating at less than half of their capacity.

Therefore, updated data indicates that the GCEP plant must be viewed as replacement capacity for the diffusion plants which are now renovated. And even with a sharp reversal in the outlook for nuclear power, new enrichment capacity can be brought on line faster than new nuclear powerplants.

Based on current conditions, the Committee endorses the Department's slowdown of construction on GCEP. Moreover, the Committee supports the allocation of $120,000,000 in fiscal year 1985 for the procurement of baseline centrifuge machines. Procurement of baseline or set III machines, which will be replaced with the more efficient set V machines, should be kept at the minimum level possible while maintaining a viable project.

Enrichment research and development.—The Department proposes to accelerate the planned evaluation of advanced technologies for future uranium enrichment programs from mid-1987 to mid-1985. The purpose of this is to reduce development costs and accelerate the introduction of the advanced technology selected to follow gaseous diffusion. The Committee endorses this accelerated evaluation essentially as presented in the President's budget. Proponents of both technological approaches agree with the accelerated technology evaluation, agree that they can both be in a position to compete effectively through the conclusion of the test period and agree to abide by the decision.

To assure a valid, objective evaluation, the Department is to establish quantifiable criteria prior to commencement of the evaluation. The Department shall assure that the technology evaluation process be as objective as possible and uses a process evaluation board to make a recommendation to the Secretary of Energy, who shall make the final selection of the process.

The following table shows the Committee's recommendation by program:

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
(Plant and Capital)	(16,332,000)	(22,800,000)	(17,800,000)	(14,800,000)
(Construction)	---	---	---	---
ADP General Reduction	---	---	-8,000,000	-10,000,000
SUBTOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	2,055,936,000	2,084,465,000	2,030,501,000	2,078,468,000
(Operating expenses)	(1,809,989,000)	(1,834,930,000)	(1,769,266,000)	(1,832,933,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(245,947,000)	(249,535,000)	(261,235,000)	(245,535,000)
(Construction)	---	---	---	---
Adjustments:				
Savings from management initiatives	---	-32,300,000	-37,300,000	-32,300,000
Undistributed - CS (ESRD - PACE)	---	---	---	---
Reserve for reimbursables - OE	---	---	---	---
Undistributed - CS(ES&RD - OE)	---	---	---	---
FY83 deferral carried forward	-65,000,000	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Use of prior year balances	---	-10,052,000	-7,052,000	---
Use of prior year balances (by transfer)	---	---	-60,000,000	-60,000,000
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	1,990,936,000	2,042,113,000	1,926,149,000	1,986,168,000
(Operating expenses)	(1,744,989,000)	(1,792,578,000)	(1,664,914,000)	(1,740,633,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(245,947,000)	(249,535,000)	(261,235,000)	(245,535,000)
(Construction)	---	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
URANIUM ENRICHMENT				
I. Uranium enrichment activities				
A. Gaseous diffusion and operations support				
Operating expenses	1,360,400,000	1,081,300,000	1,060,300,000	1,081,300,000
Capital equipment	9,900,000	15,000,000	11,000,000	15,000,000
Construction:				
85-N-501 General plant projects,var. locs	13,300,000	14,500,000	10,500,000	14,500,000
84-N-402 UF6 cylinders	4,000,000	---	---	---
84-N-403 Intermediate gas removal	1,700,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
84-N-404 Power systems protection impr	3,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
84-N-405 Utilities upgrading, Phase III	6,000,000	16,000,000	12,000,000	16,000,000
83-N-401 Rep. of elec. circuit breaker Gas dif. plant, Portsmouth, Ohio	7,000,000	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
83-N-402 Compli. with toxic sub. Control act, gas dif. plants.....	10,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000
83-N-403 UF6 cylinders storage Yards, gas. dif. plants.....	---	---	---	---
83-N-405 Utilities upgrading, Phase II, gas. dif. plant.....	10,000,000	700,000	700,000	700,000
82-R-412 Cooling tower mods.....	---	---	---	---
82-R-413 IMP UF6 containment.....	9,000,000	---	---	---
82-R-415 Fire alarm sys rep.....	---	---	---	---
82-R-416 Env/safety mods.....	3,500,000	---	---	---
81-R-506 Environmental protection and safety improvements, Phase I GDP's.....	3,500,000	14,800,000	12,800,000	14,800,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Funds for Environmental projects 82-R-416 and not approved for use under the continuing resolution agreement with congress.....	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction.....	71,000,000	75,000,000	65,000,000	75,000,000
Subtotal, Gaseous diffusion operations and suppo	1,441,300,000	1,171,300,000	1,136,300,000	1,171,300,000
B. Enrichment research and development				
1. Gas centrifuge operations and support				
Operating expenses.....	82,900,000	71,000,000	71,000,000	71,000,000
Capital equipment.....	3,400,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Construction:				
82-R-418 Advanced test facility.....	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Gas Centrifuge.....	86,300,000	72,000,000	72,000,000	72,000,000

General Science and Research Activities

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1984	$478,750,000
Budget estimate, 1985	527,705,000
House allowance	518,205,000
Committee recommendation	518,205,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−9,500,000
House allowance	

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriations, 1984	$162,500,000
Budget estimate, 1985	218,400,000
House allowance	208,700,000
Committee recommendation	208,700,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−9,700,000
House allowance	

The general science program is organized into interrelated scientific programs, high energy physics and nuclear physics. While these programs are not directly associated with energy technology in the near or mid-term, they support basic research whose aim is to provide new knowledge which is expected to have long-term scientific and technological impacts on energy development and utilization.

The Committee recommends $726,905,000 for general science and research activities, the same as the House allowance and an $85,655,000 increase over current year funding. The Committee supports a significant increase in funding and continues strong support for the science research program.

High energy physics.—The Committee recommends $547,800,000 for high energy physics, an increase of $2,000,000 over the House allowance and $13,200,000 below the budget request. The recommendation represents a $67,800,000 increase over current year funding and $116,815,000 over the fiscal year 1983 level of support.

Although a preliminary design study of the next generation of high-energy accelerator (SSC) has already been initiated and plans are being made to extend such studies, little effort has been devoted to organized investigations of what physics will be revealed by such an accelerator in the 1 to 100 TeV energy range. The Committee strongly recommends that a workshop be held and supporting equipment be provided to study in depth over an extended period the physics at super high energies. This study should identify areas where significant breakthroughs in the fundamental understanding of nature can be expected. It should detail what present theories predict at such energies and what phenomenological guidance is needed to develop new and realistic theoretical ideas. The workshop should involve leaders in the field and should be completed by December 1985, in order to allow the results to be of use to the design of the SSC.

Nuclear physics.—The recommendation includes $180,600,000 for

nuclear physics activities, a reduction of $3,000,000 below the budget request and an increase of $43,625,000 or 27 percent above the 1984 level of funding.

The Department presently supports seven national accelerator facilities in nuclear physics as well as four dedicated university accelerators. The total operating budget for these 11 nuclear physics accelerators is $73,800,000 in fiscal year 1985. Even with an increased budget, the overall utilization level for the seven national facilities will drop from 62 percent in 1984 to 54 percent in 1985. The Committee is concerned about the direction of the program particularly in view of future budget constraints and proposals for new accelerator facilities. Accordingly, the Department shall develop and submit a 5-year nuclear physics plan including funding assumptions to the Committee on Appropriations before January 1, 1985, for consideration with the fiscal year 1986 budget request.

For project 85-R-203, the Continuous Electron Beam Accelerator Facility (CEBAF), the Committee includes $2,500,000 to continue work in support of the project, but defers the request for construction funding. This reflects the Committee decision to further consider in the next budget cycle the purpose and need for this new accelerator facility and the possible establishment of another national laboratory. The funds are provided under operating expenses to be used for research and development and A/E activities to better define the project's scope, schedule, and total cost, and for other necessary activities in support of the project. The Department is to provide this information in a more detailed report which also addresses the need for this accelerator along with defining the work and research which will be conducted at this proposed facility.

In connection with the concerns already expressed about this budget and new facilities, the Committee expects the departmental 5-year plan to include assumptions with and without the CEBAF project.

The following tabulation shows the Committee recommendation for each program and activity:

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
2. Atomic vapor laser isotope separation				
Operating expenses	89,900,000	69,800,000	69,800,000	69,800,000
Capital equipment	9,500,000	7,700,000	7,700,000	7,700,000
Construction:				
85-N-501 General plant projects, var. locs	1,200,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
84-N-407 Development I demonstration Module (design only)	2,400,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	3,600,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
Subtotal, Atomic vapor laser isotope separation	103,000,000	78,000,000	78,000,000	78,000,000
Total, Enrichment R&D	189,300,000	150,000,000	150,000,000	150,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Gas centriuge enrichment plant				
Operating expenses	34,500,000	39,800,000	39,800,000	39,800,000
Capital equipment	---	200,000	200,000	200,000
Construction:				
76-8-G Enriched Uranium production facility, Portsmouth, OH	546,000,000	310,000,000	310,000,000	310,000,000
Total, Gas centrifuge enrichment plant	580,500,000	350,000,000	350,000,000	350,000,000
D. Program direction - DE	3,900,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
General reduction - DE	-372,000	---	---	---
General reduction - CONST	-22,628,000	---	---	---
Advanced technology activities reserve	---	---	10,000,000	---
Subtotal, Uranium enrichment activities	2,192,000,000	1,675,300,000	1,650,300,000	1,675,300,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
(Operating expenses)	(1,571,228,000)	(1,265,900,000)	(1,254,900,000)	(1,265,900,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(620,772,000)	(409,400,000)	(395,400,000)	(409,400,000)
(Construction)	---	---	---	---
II. Uranium resource assessment				
A. Assessment program				
Operating expenses	1,810,000	---	---	---
B. Program direction - OE	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Uranium resource assessment	1,810,000	---	---	---
Total, Uranium enrichment	2,193,810,000	1,675,300,000	1,650,300,000	1,675,300,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
III. Offsetting revenues				
Operating expenses	-1,490,228,000	-1,265,900,000	-1,240,900,000	-1,265,900,000
Capital equipment	-16,800,000	-23,900,000	-23,900,000	-23,900,000
Construction	-597,972,000	-385,500,000	-385,500,000	-385,500,000
Subtotal, Total revenues	-2,105,000,000	-1,675,300,000	-1,650,300,000	-1,675,300,000
TOTAL, URANIUM ENRICHMENT	88,810,000	---	---	---
(Operating expenses)	(1,573,038,000)	(1,265,900,000)	(1,254,900,000)	(1,265,900,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(620,772,000)	(409,400,000)	(395,400,000)	(409,400,000)
(Construction)	---	---	---	---
(Gross revenues)	(-2,105,000,000)	(-1,675,300,000)	(-1,650,300,000)	(-1,675,300,000)

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH				
I. High energy physics				
A. Physics research				
Operating expenses	99,500,000	107,700,000	107,700,000	107,700,000
B. Facility operations				
Operating expenses	161,000,000	182,100,000	177,100,000	177,100,000
Capital equipment	48,000,000	61,500,000	52,800,000	54,800,000
Construction:				
85-R-100 AIP	9,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
85-R-101 GPP	7,000,000	10,200,000	10,200,000	10,200,000
84-ER-133 SLAC linear collider (SLC)	32,000,000	60,500,000	60,500,000	60,500,000
82-E-206 Tevatron II	13,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000

Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund

Appropriations, 1984	$319,621,000
Budget estimate, 1985	327,669,000
House allowance	327,669,000
Committee recommendation	327,669,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (Public Law 97–425) establishes the nuclear waste disposal fund to finance activities related to development, construction, and operation of a commercial high-level waste repository and a proposal for a monitored retrievable storage (MRS) facility.

The fund is to be financed by fees paid by nuclear utilities. The budget request in fiscal year 1985 is $327,669,000. Revenues are used to meet required appropriations, with revenues in excess of requirements being retained in the fund as offsets to future needs.

Research conducted to date in this and other countries suggest that the use of copper as the canister material for the permanent disposal of nuclear wastes in underground waste repositories should be more thoroughly explored. The Department is presently considering viable options for the terminal disposal of nuclear wastes, including the design of geologic repositories mandated by the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1976. The Committee, therefore, directs the Department to thoroughly review the potential of copper as the waste package canister material and report back to the Committee by the close of fiscal year 1985 on its findings. The report should include the types of repositories in which copper can be utilized, possible designs, and related techniques. This investigation can be accomplished within the available funds.

Atomic Energy Defense Activities

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1984	$5,094,720,000
Budget estimate, 1985	5,916,594,000
House allowance	5,757,470,000
Committee recommendation	5,660,720,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−255,874,000
House allowance	−96,750,000

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriations, 1984	$1,466,050,000
Budget estimate, 1985	1,889,231,000
House allowance	1,647,431,000
Committee recommendation	1,663,331,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−225,900,000
House allowance	+15,900,000

The Committee recommends a total appropriation of $7,324,051,000 for atomic energy defense activities.

The appropriation recommended for atomic energy defense activities supports inertial confinement fusion, naval reactors development, the research, development, testing, production and stockpile maintenance for nuclear weapons, verification and control technology, special materials production, defense waste management and nuclear materials security and safeguards.

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

The Committee recommends substantial increases in spending for the research, development, testing, production, and surveillance of nuclear weapons in order to meet national defense requirements. The budget includes funds for the production of seven nuclear weapons systems—the B61–3 and –4 bombs, the W76 warhead for the Trident, the W79 warhead for the artillery fired atomic projectile, the W80–0 warhead for the sea launched cruise missile, the W80–1 warhead for the air launched cruise missile, the B83 modern strategic bomb, the W84 warhead for the ground launched cruise missile, and the W85 Pershing II missile warheads. In fiscal year 1984, nine systems are in full production with the planned completion of production for the W70–3 warhead for the Lance missile, and the W78 warhead for the Minuteman II.

Efforts are also underway in anticipation of future production of a number of additional warheads and bombs including the W87 warhead for the MX missile, and the warhead for the Trident II missile.

Research and development.—The Committee recommends $1,044,085,000 for research and development activities, an increase of $218,255,000 over the 1984 level and $5,800,000 above the House allowance.

The recommendation for operating expenses includes sufficient funds for an increase of 300 full-time positions at the weapons laboratories as requested by the administration. The recommendation includes $3,100,000 for additional operating expenses at the Los Alamos Meson Physics Facility to bring the number of operating weeks to the level funded in fiscal year 1984.

The Committee allowance for research and development includes funds at approximately the same level as provided in the past for the S–1 project and for the laser pantography project at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. These two related projects represent the bulk of the Department's effort in the design, prototyping, and evaluation of leading-edge supercomputer systems for both national security and scientific purposes. The S–1 project, which the Committee has supported in the past, has recently demonstrated some of the most powerful supercomputer systems in existence and has transferred much of the enabling technology out to the industrial sector, while the laser pantography project has conducted early demonstrations of unprecedentedly rapid implementation of supercomputer circuitry, using a novel laser-based approach. By this action, the Committee emphasizes its concern for continued American leadership of the entire supercomputing field and its support for effective Government R&D cooperation with American industry toward this goal.

Project 85–D–101, general plant projects, the Committee recommends $19,000,000, a reduction of $5,100,000 below the budget request, but a 19-percent increase over fiscal year 1984.

Project 85–D–102, nuclear weapons research, development, and testing facilities revitalization, various locations, the recommendation includes $36,600,000 to initiate this effort in lieu of the $46,600,000 allowed by the House. The Committee notes that many of the activities included in this project were a part of project 84–D–107, nuclear test facilities revitalization, various locations, as proposed in the fiscal year 1984 budget.

Project 82–D–144, simulation technology laboratory, the Committee provides $16,500,000 and restores the House reduction to the request in order to move toward completion in the most cost-effective manner.

Project 83–D–199, buffer land acquisition, the recommendation includes $11,800,000, an increase over current year levels and $5,000,000 below the budget request.

Testing.—The Committee recommends $620,390,000 for testing activities which is $66,020,000 over the current funding level and $17,600,000 below the budget request.

For operating expenses, the recommendation includes $538,000,000, an increase of $6,000,000 over the House allowance and $10,000,000 below the budget request.

For construction, the Committee recommends $38,600,000, a reduction of $7,600,000 from the budget request, but an increase of $9,000,000 over the fiscal year 1984 level.

The Committee specifically includes $6,000,000 within the research, development, and testing allocation as requested in the budget for the Marshall Islands and environmental programs. These activities are a legacy of the atmospheric nuclear testing conducted by Federal agencies from 1946 to 1958. Therefore, the Committee believes it is proper to include these activities within the budget request for defense programs.

Inertial confinement fusion.—The Committee recommends $152,000,000 for the ICF program, an increase of $14,000,000 over the budget request and $17,250,000 below the House allowance.

The recommendation includes $7,200,000 for Rochester, $13,000,000 for KMS, $42,500,000 for Los Alamos to operate ANTARES in fiscal year 1985, and the budget request level of $20,800,000 for Sandia.

Production and surveillance.—The Committee recommendation provides for $2,344,100,000 for production, surveillance, and maintenance of nuclear weapons, an increase of more than 10 percent or $243,875,000 over fiscal year 1984 level of funding.

For operating expenses, the Committee includes $1,812,900,000 which is $147,175,000 above the current year level. Since overall workload has not increased substantially, the Committee concluded that the total increase requested was larger than necessary. Although an increase in the weapon complexity factor will result in additional funding requirements for fiscal year 1985, an increase of over 20 percent is not justified.

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
81-E-218 Tevatron I.....	20,000,000	21,300,000	21,300,000	21,300,000
78-10-B Intersecting storage accelerator (Isabelle) Brookhaven national lab, NY.....	5,000,000	---	---	---
75-6-C Positron election joind project.....	---	---	---	---
Prior year projects.....	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction.....	86,000,000	114,000,000	114,000,000	114,000,000
Subtotal, Facility operations.....	295,000,000	357,600,000	343,900,000	345,900,000
C. High energy technology				
Operating expenses.....	82,000,000	91,800,000	90,300,000	90,300,000
D. Other capital equipment - CE.....	3,500,000	3,900,000	3,900,000	3,900,000
Subtotal, High energy physics.....	480,000,000	561,000,000	545,800,000	547,800,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
(Operating expenses).....	(342,500,000)	(381,600,000)	(375,100,000)	(375,100,000)
(Plant and Capital).....	(137,500,000)	(179,400,000)	(170,700,000)	(172,700,000)
(Construction).....	---	---	---	---
II. Nuclear physics				
A. Medium energy physics				
Operating expenses.....	65,000,000	72,000,000	72,000,000	72,000,000
B. Heavy ion physics				
Operating expenses.....	47,000,000	49,800,000	49,800,000	49,800,000
C. Low energy nuclear physics				
Operating expenses.....	13,000,000	13,500,000	13,500,000	13,500,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
D. Nuclear theory				
Operating expenses	9,000,000	9,300,000	9,300,000	9,300,000
Capital equipment	10,500,000	12,900,000	11,900,000	11,900,000
Construction:				
85-R-200 AIP	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
85-R-201 GPP	2,200,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
85-R-203 Continuous elect. beam accelerator	---	2,000,000	2,000,000	---
84-ER-110 Univ Accel upgrade	8,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000
884-R-123 Tandem/AGS Heavy Ion transfer lines	---	5,300,000	5,300,000	5,300,000
82-E-223 Argonne tandem acc sys - ATLAS	---	---	---	---
Subtotal Construction	---	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
E. Other capital equipment - CE.....	800,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
Subtotal, Nuclear physics.....	159,000,000	183,600,000	182,600,000	180,600,000
(Operating expenses).....	(134,000,000)	(144,600,000)	(144,600,000)	(144,600,000)
(Plant and Capital).....	(25,000,000)	(39,000,000)	(38,000,000)	(36,000,000)
(Construction).....	---	---	---	---
III. General Science program direction - OE.....	2,250,000	2,205,000	2,205,000	2,205,000
ADP General Reduction.....	---	---	-3,000,000	-3,000,000
SUBTOTAL, GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH.....	641,250,000	746,805,000	727,605,000	727,605,000
(Operating expenses).....	(478,750,000)	(528,405,000)	(518,905,000)	(518,905,000)
(Plant and Capital).....	(162,500,000)	(218,400,000)	(208,700,000)	(208,700,000)
(Construction).....	---	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Adjustments:				
Unobligated balance transferred from ESRD - ER(GS-OE).	---	---	---	---
Savings from FY84 initiatives	---	-700,000	-700,000	-700,000
Total, Adjustments	---	-700,000	-700,000	-700,000
TOTAL, GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH	641,250,000	746,105,000	726,905,000	726,905,000
(Operating expenses)	(478,750,000)	(527,705,000)	(518,205,000)	(518,205,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(162,500,000)	(218,400,000)	(208,700,000)	(208,700,000)
(Construction)	---	---	---	---

The Committee believes that with prudent management and through the full utilization of previously funded improvements in manufacturing technologies and equipment, the recommendation is adequate to maintain production schedules for all high priority systems including the cruise missile warheads, the Trident warhead, and the modern strategic bomb. Full funding is included for preproduction activities for the MX missile warhead and the Trident II warhead. The proposed reduction in operating funds also reflects and is consistent with the Committee action to defer facilities for the SM–2 warhead and the ASW warhead.

For construction, the recommendation provides $406,800,000, which is $78,700,000 over the current funding level, and $3,000,000 above the House allowance. The Committee has deferred the initiation of facilities to begin production of the SM–2 missile warhead and the antisubmarine warhead. The Committee is not satisfied with the justification of need to begin facilities construction for these systems in fiscal year 1985.

The Committee recommendation provides the full budget request for Trident II warhead facilities and the MX warhead facilities.

Project 85–D–111, general plant projects, the Committee recommends $27,100,000, the same as the House, in lieu of the requested amount of $32,200,000.

Project 85–D–115, renovate plutonium building utility systems, the recommendation would defer initiation of this project due to budgetary constraints.

Project 84–D–112, Trident II warhead production facilities, the Committee provides $60,700,000, the same as the budget request and $20,000,000 over the House allowance.

Project 84–D–114, consolidated nonnuclear manufacturing facility, the Committee concurs with the House reduction from the budget request. The $18,100,000 provided is adequate due to the reduction in cost estimates because of favorable economic conditions.

Project 84–D–118, high explosive subassembly facility, the Committee recommends deferral of this project due to a delay in the completion of preconstruction design activities.

Project 84–D–124, environmental improvements, the recommendation includes $21,400,000, the same as the budget request and $13,000,000 over the House allowance.

Project 79–7–0, universal pilot plant, the Committee defers funding for this project which the Department has proposed to reduce in prior years in order to fund higher priority activities.

MATERIALS PRODUCTION

The materials production program primarily provides the special nuclear materials used in the development, testing, and production of nuclear weapons. The Committee recommends large increases to allow the Department to continue to operate necessary production reactors, processing facilities, and support facilities. The recommendation will continue the escalated efforts to restart the L reactor at the Savannah River

plant, to produce additional quantities of weapon-grade material in the three operating Savannah River production reactors, to reactivate and operate the PUREX fuel processing facility at Hanford, and to operate the N reactor at Hanford for weapon-grade plutonium production.

The Committee recognizes that new initiatives may be necessary to meet the projected requirements for special nuclear materials. Nevertheless, the Committee is concerned that the Department has proposed several expensive initiatives that appear to provide only marginal supply contributions.

Because of the magnitude of the investment and lead times involved, the Department must give increased emphasis to long-term planning in the materials production program.

The availability of special nuclear materials is influenced as much by recovery of materials from weapons being retired as it is influenced by the new production of such materials. Additional attention needs to be focused on the retirement program as well as all other alternatives for meeting special materials requirements.

The Committee recommendation for materials production totals $1,711,100,000 which is $34,800,000 below the budget request and $175,200,000 over the fiscal year 1984 level.

Reactor operations.—The Committee provides $551,235,000 for reactor operations, an increase of $6,000,000 over the House allowance and $66,990,000 over the 1984 funding level. The significant increase from current levels of funding provides for operation of reactor feed plants at Fernald and Astabula, Ohio, and Oak Ridge, Tenn., the N reactor at Richland, Wash., and four production reactors at Savannah River, S.C.

For construction, the recommendation reduces the request which slows initiation of project 85–D–142, U308 fuel tube facility and project 84–D–136, enriched uranium conversion facility. Due to budget stringencies, the Committee also defers project 83–D–180, facility storage modification.

Processing of nuclear materials.—The Committee recommends $444,270,000 for processing of nuclear materials. This total amount is the same as the budget request and $52,475,000 over the 1984 level of funding. This allowance will provide for major processing activities at Richland, Savannah River, and Idaho Falls.

Supporting services.—The Committee recommendation for supporting services includes $409,935,000, an increase of $8,900,000 over the House allowance and $31,941,000 over the fiscal year 1984 level.

For operating expenses, the Committee recommends $247,985,000, an increase of $40,025,000 above the fiscal year 1984 level and $10,000,000 below the House allowance. The Committee reduces slightly the increases proposed for lower priority research activities including the administration proposed deferral for contingency options for tritium production.

For construction, the recommendation provides $161,950,000 which is $18,900,000 more than the House and $5,500,000 below the budget request.

Enriched material.—The Committee recommends $142,800,000 for enriched materials necessary for fuels for the production reactors and naval reactor cores. The recommendation does not include funding for the Mark 15 effort or for the N reactor fuel cycle activities which is consistent with the Department's recommendation.

Capital equipment.—The Committee recommends $117,660,000 for capital equipment, an increase of $19,160,000 over 1984 funding which represents a 19-percent increase.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommendation provides a total of $752,771,000 for defense nuclear waste and by-products activities, the same as the budget request and $25,400,000 above the House allowance. This recommendation is $71,671,000 over the fiscal year 1984 level.

For operating expenses, $358,700,000 is provided, the same as the budget request and the House allowance. In conformance with the budget request, no funding is available in fiscal year 1985 for byproducts and beneficial uses activities.

For construction, the Committee recommends $394,071,000, the same as the budget request and $25,400,000 over the House allowance.

Project 81–T–105, defense waste processing facility at Savannah River, the Committee restores the House reduction to the requested level in the budget and provides $238,000,000 for the project.

Project 77–13–F, waste isolation pilot plant, the Committee includes $61,100,000, the same as the budget request and $10,400,000 over the House allowance.

NAVAL REACTORS DEVELOPMENT

The Committee recommends $496,900,000 for naval reactors development, the same as the House allowance and $3,900,000 over the fiscal year 1984 level of funding. An amount of $426,400,000 is included for operating expenses, the same as the House and the budget request.

VERIFICATION AND CONTROL TECHNOLOGY

The Committee recommendation for verification and control technology provides $76,700,000, the same as the House allowance and the budget request. The total amount recommended represents a 19-percent increase from current year levels. The Committee, however, believes this increase is justified based on the important contributions made by these programs in the area of verification and arms control technology.

The importance of space-based verification systems to national defense is expanding, and adequate verification is an indispensible requirement for all arms control agreements. The Committee, therefore, encourages the Department of Energy to continue to strengthen those technology projects that may support future verification and intelligence missions. Increased support for this program is provided by the Committee's recommendation due to an increased space program in addition to a continuing terrestrial verification program. The fiscal year 1985 rec-

ommendation will continue to exploit the scientific and engineering resource base existing in the three nuclear weapons laboratories.

NUCLEAR SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee recommends $55,100,000 for nuclear materials security and safeguards development within this program, the same as the House allowance and the budget request.

SECURITY INVESTIGATIONS

The recommendation includes $34,000,000 for security investigations, the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Details of the Committee's recommendation, current year estimates, the budget request, and House allowance are shown in the following table:

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES				
I. Weapons activities				
A. Research, development and testing				
1. Research and development				
Operating expenses	710,730,000	815,625,000	805,625,000	815,625,000
Capital equipment	68,800,000	83,660,000	78,660,000	78,660,000
Construction:				
85-D-101 General plant projects, various locations	16,000,000	24,100,000	19,000,000	19,000,000
85-D-102 Nuclear weapons research, development, and testing facs revitalization, various locations	---	56,600,000	46,600,000	36,600,000
85-D-103 Safeguards and security enhancements, LLNL and SNLL	---	4,700,000	4,700,000	4,700,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
85-D-106 Hardened radiography fac site 300, LLNL, CA	---	800,000	---	---
85-D-106 Hardened engineering test bldg, LLNL	---	---	800,000	800,000
84-D-102 Radiation hardened integrated circuit lab, SNLA	2,000,000	20,000,000	14,000,000	20,000,000
84-D-103 Hardened central guard force facility, LANL, NM	600,000	5,600,000	5,600,000	5,600,000
84-D-104 Nuclear materials storage facility, LANL, NM	700,000	6,500,000	6,500,000	6,500,000
84-D-105 Safeguards and security upgrades, Phase I, LANL, NM	---	10,100,000	5,100,000	10,100,000
84-D-106 Security system upgrade, SNLA, NM	---	2,300,000	1,500,000	2,300,000
83-D-122 Los Alamos airport improvement, LANL	---	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
83-D-199 Buffer land acquisition, LLNL	7,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	11,000,000
82-D-144 Simulation technology laboratory, SNLA.....	8,000,000	16,500,000	11,500,000	16,500,000
82-D-150 Weapons materials research and development facility, LLNL.....	2,900,000	16,800,000	16,800,000	11,800,000
82-D-152 New detonator facility, LANL.....	5,600,000	---	---	---
82-D-153 Tritium facility, LANL.....	---	---	---	---
81-D-133 Earthquake damage restoration, LLNL, CA.....	---	---	---	---
81-D-134 Earthquake damage restoration, SNLL, CA.....	---	4,900,000	4,900,000	4,900,000
79-7-C Proton storage ring, LANL, NM.....	---	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
78-16-G Radioactive liquid waste improvement, LAML, NM	3,500,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	46,300,000	185,900,000	154,000,000	149,800,000
Subtotal, Research and development	825,830,000	1,085,185,000	1,038,285,000	1,044,085,000
2. Testing				
Operating expenses	485,170,000	548,000,000	532,000,000	538,000,000
Capital equipment	39,600,000	43,790,000	43,790,000	43,790,000
Construction:				
85-D-101 General plant projects, various locations	6,100,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000
85-D-104 Test device assembly building, LAML	---	800,000	800,000	800,000
85-D-105 Combined assembly fac, NTS, NV	---	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
84-D-108 Safeguards and site security upgrade, NTS, NV	---	---	5,400,000	5,400,000
84-D-107 Nuclear test facilities revitalization, various locations	23,500,000	34,900,000	30,900,000	21,900,000
Subtotal Construction	29,600,000	46,200,000	47,600,000	38,600,000
Subtotal, Testing	554,370,000	637,990,000	623,390,000	620,390,000
Subtotal, Research, development and testing	1,380,200,000	1,723,175,000	1,661,675,000	1,664,475,000
B. Inertial confinement fusion				
Operating expenses	145,000,000	125,000,000	154,750,000	139,000,000
Capital equipment	11,800,000	9,500,000	11,000,000	9,500,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Construction:				
81-D-101 Particle beam fusion accelerator-II SNL, NM	12,900,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
78-4-A High energy laser facility (NOVA) LLNL, CA	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	12,900,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
Subtotal, Inertial confinement fusion	169,700,000	138,000,000	169,250,000	152,000,000
C. Production and surveillance				
Operating expenses	1,665,725,000	1,947,900,000	1,872,900,000	1,812,900,000
Capital equipment	106,400,000	134,400,000	124,400,000	124,400,000
Construction:				
85-D-111 General plant projects, various locations	23,000,000	32,200,000	27,100,000	27,100,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
85-D-112 Enriched uranium recovery improvements, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	---	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
85-D-113 Plant power and steam dist system, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	---	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
85-D-114 Safeguards vaults, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	---	3,100,000	3,100,000	3,100,000
85-D-115 Renovate plutonium building utility systems, Rocky Flats, CO	---	5,800,000	5,800,000	---
85-D-121 Air and water pollution control facs, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	---	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
85-D-122 Safeguards and site security upgrade, Mound Facility, Miamisburg, OH	---	2,700,000	2,700,000	2,700,000
85-D-123 Safeguards and site security upgrade, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
85-D-124 Safeguards and site security upgrade, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, CO	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
85-D-125 Tactical bomb production facility, various locations.....	---	10,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
84-D-112 TRIDENT II warhead production facilities, various locations	19,300,000	60,700,000	40,700,000	60,700,000
84-D-113 Antisubmarine warfare/standoff weapon warhead prod facs, var locations	---	15,000,000	5,000,000	---
84-D-114 Consolidated nonnuclear manufacturing facility, Rocky Flats, CO	24,100,000	21,100,000	18,100,000	18,100,000
84-D-115 Electrical system expansion, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	1,500,000	10,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
84-D-117 Inert assembly & test facility Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	1,500,000	11,700,000	6,700,000	6,700,000

32-250 O - 84 - 12

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
84-D-118 High explosive subassembly facility, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	7,000,000	40,000,000	---	---
84-D-119 Railroad track replacement and upgrade, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	800,000	6,800,000	6,800,000	6,800,000
84-D-120 Explosive component test facility, Mound Laboratory, Miamisburg, OH	3,100,000	16,900,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
84-D-121 Safeguards and security upgrade, Rocky Flats, CO	10,000,000	11,200,000	11,200,000	11,200,000
84-D-124 Environmental improvements, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	---	21,400,000	8,400,000	21,400,000
84-D-211 Safeguards and site security upgrading, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	---	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000
84-D-212 Safeguards and site security upgrade, Pinellas Plant, FL	---	2,700,000	1,000,000	2,700,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
83-D-124 Standard missile-2 (SM-2) warhead production facilities, various locations.....	---	9,000,000	---	---
83-D-200 Plant capacity expansion, Pinellas Plant, St. Petersburg, FL	---	---	---	---
82-D-106 Weapon assembly facilities, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX.....	-5,000,000	---	---	---
82-D-107 Utilities & equip restoration, replace & upgrade, Phase III, var locations..	185,000,000	175,100,000	175,100,000	175,100,000
82-D-108 Nuclear weapons stockpile improvement, various locations	4,000,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	---
82-D-111 Interactive graphics system, various locations	8,600,000	6,800,000	2,900,000	2,900,000
82-D-146 Weapons prod & prod support facs, various locations.....	14,200,000	10,000,000	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
81-D-115 MX warhead prod facs, various locations	30,000,000	20,900,000	20,900,000	20,900,000
81-D-120 Control of effluents & pollutants, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	1,000,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
79-7-O Universal pilot plant, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	---	15,400,000	15,400,000	---
78-16-A Cruise missile production facilities various, locations	---	---	---	---
78-17-D Steam plant improvements, Y-12 Plant Oak Ridge, TN	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	328,100,000	539,400,000	403,800,000	406,800,000
Subtotal, Production and surveillance	2,100,225,000	2,621,700,000	2,401,100,000	2,34[illegible],100,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
D. Program direction				
Operating expenses				
1. Weapons program	57,495,000	47,589,000	47,589,000	47,589,000
3. Community assistance	---	12,640,000	13,266,000	13,266,000
Subtotal, Program direction	57,495,000	60,229,000	60,855,000	60,855,000
Subtotal, Weapons activities	3,707,620,000	4,543,104,000	4,292,880,000	4,221,430,000
(Operating expenses)	(3,064,120,000)	(3,496,754,000)	(3,426,130,000)	(3,366,380,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(643,500,000)	(1,046,350,000)	(866,750,000)	(855,050,000)
(Construction)	---	---	---	---
II. Verification and control technology				
A. Verification and control technology				
Operating expenses	57,150,000	70,500,000	70,500,000	70,500,000
Capital equipment	1,750,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Construction:				
85-D-171 Space science laboratory, LANL, NM	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Subtotal, Verification and control technology....	58,900,000	73,500,000	73,500,000	73,500,000
B. Program direction	2,750,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000
Subtotal, Verification and control technology....	61,650,000	76,700,000	76,700,000	76,700,000
(Operating expenses).....	(59,900,000)	(73,700,000)	(73,700,000)	(73,700,000)
(Plant and Capital).....	(1,750,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)
(Construction).....	---	---	---	---
III. Materials production				
A. Reactor operations				
Operating expenses.....	484,245,000	557,235,000	545,235,000	551,235,000
Construction:				
85-D-136 Components protection system, 100-N area, Richland, WA	---	3,300,000	3,300,000	3,300,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
85-D-142 U308 fuel tube facilities, fuel preparation area, Savannah River, SC	---	8,000,000	4,000,000	---
85-D-145 Uranyl nitrate to oxide conversion facility, Savannah River, SC	---	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
84-D-136 Enriched uranium conversion facility modifications, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	---	8,000,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
83-D-180 Facility storage modifications, various locations	---	6,500,000	6,500,000	---
83-D-146 Water pollution control, FMPC, Fernald, Ohio.....	4,000,000	4,100,000	4,100,000	4,100,000
82-D-126 Reactor safety and reliability, various locations.....	14,500,000	11,300,000	11,300,000	11,300,000
81-D-142 Steam transfer header, Savannah River Plant, SC.....	7,400,000	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
81-D-143 L-reactor upgrade, Savannah River, SC	---	---	---	---
Prior year projects	-34,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	25,866,000	43,000,000	35,400,000	24,900,000
Subtotal, Reactor operations	510,111,000	600,235,000	580,635,000	576,135,000
D. Processing of nuclear materials				
Operating expenses	347,595,000	412,770,000	439,770,000	412,770,000
Construction:				
85-D-137 Vault safety SNM inventory system, Richland, WA	---	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
84-D-130 Modification processing facility substations, Savannah River, SC	5,600,000	200,000	200,000	200,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
84-D-135 Process facility modifications, Richland, WA	7,500,000	---	10,000,000	---
83-D-142 Fuel dissolver off-gas transfer and treatment system, IFPF, INEL, ID	4,100,000	---	---	---
82-D-201 Special plutonium recovery facs, JB Line, Savannah River, SC	26,000,000	28,800,000	20,000,000	28,800,000
81-D-126 Pollution abatement facilities-chemical processing plants, Richland, WA	---	---	---	---
81-D-131 Remote analytical facility upgrade and expansion, IFPF, INEL, ID	2,000,000	---	---	---
81-T-502 Advanced isotope separation lab, LLNL, CA	---	---	---	---
80-AE-2 Replace obsolete processing facs., HB-Line, Savannah River, SC	-1,000,000	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
77-13-A Fluorinel dissolution process & fuel receivins improve, IFPF, INEL, ID.....	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction.....	44,200,000	31,500,000	32,700,000	31,500,000
Subtotal, Processins of nuclear materials.....	391,795,000	444,270,000	472,470,000	444,270,000
C. Supportins services				
Operatins expenses.....	207,960,000	257,985,000	257,985,000	247,985,000
Construction:				
85-D-131 General plant projects, various locations	28,000,000	32,000,000	29,500,000	29,500,000
85-D-132 Plant ensineerins and desisn	1,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
84-D-137 Facility security systems upsrade, IFPF, INEL, ID	---	8,000,000	2,000,000	8,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
85-D-139 Fuel processing restoration, IFPF, INEL, ID	---	10,000,000	5,000,000	10,000,000
85-D-140 Productivity and radiological improvements, FMPC, Fernald, OH	---	6,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
84-D-134 Safeguards and security improvements Plant-wide, Savannah River, SC	---	14,900,000	12,000,000	14,900,000
83-D-138 Purex canyon & dissolver filter systems improvements, Richland, WA	8,500,000	---	---	---
83-D-147 Pollution discharge elimination, Savannah River, SC	2,000,000	2,150,000	2,150,000	2,150,000
83-D-148 Non-radioactive hazardous waste management, Savannah River, SC	3,000,000	11,500,000	7,500,000	11,500,000
82-D-118 N-reactor plant security and surveillance, Richland, WA	2,400,000	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
82-D-124 Restoration of production capabilities, Phases II, III, IV & V var locs ..	97,134,000	72,800,000	72,800,000	72,800,000
82-D-127 Safeguards improvements, Savannah River Plant, SC.....	7,000,000	6,700,000	6,700,000	6,700,000
82-D-128 Plant perimeter security systems upgrade, IFPF, INEL, IDAHO.....	3,000,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
82-D-136 Fuel processing facilities upgrade, IFPF, INEL, Idaho.....	18,000,000	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
81-D-128 Restoration of production capabilities, Phase I, various locations.....	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction.....	170,034,000	167,450,000	143,050,000	161,950,000
Subtotal, Supporting services.....	377,994,000	425,435,000	401,035,000	409,935,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
D. Enriched material	140,000,000	245,300,000	148,800,000	142,800,000
E. Capital equipment	98,500,000	128,660,000	122,660,000	117,660,000
F. Program direction	17,500,000	20,300,000	20,300,000	20,300,000
Subtotal, Materials production	1,535,900,000	1,864,200,000	1,745,900,000	1,711,100,000
(Operating expenses)	(1,197,300,000)	(1,493,590,000)	(1,412,090,000)	(1,375,090,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(338,600,000)	(370,610,000)	(333,810,000)	(336,010,000)
(Construction)	---	---	---	---
IV. Defense waste and by-products management				
A. Interim waste management				
Operating expenses	221,026,000	240,400,000	240,400,000	240,400,000
Construction:				
85-D-156 General plant projects, various locations	22,830,000	25,645,000	25,645,000	25,645,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
85-D-157 7th calcined solids storage facility, INEL, ID	---	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
85-D-158 Central warehouse upgrade, Richland, WA	---	700,000	700,000	700,000
85-D-159 New waste transfer facilities H-Area, Savannah River, SC	---	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000
85-D-160 TRA security system upgrade, INEL, ID	---	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
83-D-157 Additional radioactive waste storage facilities, Richland, WA	31,000,000	3,155,000	3,155,000	3,155,000
82-N-103 Waste handling & isolation facs, Richland, WA	3,570,000	9,700,000	9,700,000	9,700,000
82-N-104 Waste transfer facilities, Richland, WA	---	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
82-N-107 Rail replacement/Hanford railroad, Richland, WA	3,000,000	---	---	---
81-T-104 Radioactive waste facs. improves., ORNL, Oak Ridge, TN	4,000,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	64,400,000	59,200,000	59,200,000	59,200,000
Subtotal, Interim waste management	285,426,000	299,600,000	299,600,000	299,600,000
B. Long-term waste management technology				
Operating expenses	64,604,000	90,400,000	90,400,000	90,400,000
Construction:				
83-D-159 General plant projects	---	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
81-T-105 Defense waste processing facility, Savannah River, SC	142,000,000	238,000,000	223,000,000	238,000,000
Subtotal, Construction	142,000,000	238,000,000	223,000,000	238,000,000
Subtotal, Long-term waste management technology	206,604,000	328,400,000	313,400,000	328,400,000
C. Terminal storage				
Operating expenses	27,800,000	25,800,000	25,800,000	25,800,000
Construction:				
77-13-F Waste isolation pilot plant, Delaware Basin, Southeast, NM	109,300,000	61,100,000	50,700,000	61,100,000
Subtotal, Terminal storage	137,100,000	86,900,000	76,500,000	86,900,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
D. Byproducts and beneficial uses				
Operating expenses	10,000,000	---	---	---
Construction:				
84-D-200 Byproducts beneficial uses coop demo plants, various locations	5,000,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Byproducts beneficial uses	15,000,000	---	---	---
D. Capital equipment	34,500,000	35,771,000	35,771,000	35,771,000
E. Program direction	2,470,000	2,100,000	2,100,000	2,100,000
Subtotal, Defense waste & by-products management	681,100,000	752,771,000	727,371,000	752,771,000
(Operating expenses)	(325,900,000)	(358,700,000)	(358,700,000)	(358,700,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(355,200,000)	(394,071,000)	(368,671,000)	(394,071,000)
(Construction)	---	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
V. Nuclear safeguards and security				
A. Nuclear safeguards and security				
Operating expenses	41,650,000	50,400,000	50,400,000	50,400,000
Capital equipment	4,000,000	4,700,000	4,700,000	4,700,000
Construction:				
83-D-175 General plant projects	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Nuclear safeguards and security	45,650,000	55,100,000	55,100,000	55,100,000
B. Program direction	6,350,000	7,600,000	7,600,000	7,600,000
Subtotal Nuclear safeguards and security	52,000,000	62,700,000	62,700,000	62,700,000
(Operating expenses)	(48,000,000)	(58,000,000)	(58,000,000)	(58,000,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(4,000,000)	(4,700,000)	(4,700,000)	(4,700,000)
(Construction)	---	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
VI. Security investigations - DE.....	29,500,000	34,000,000	34,000,000	34,000,000
VII. Naval reactors development				
A. Plant development				
Operating expenses.....	59,000,000	63,900,000	63,900,000	63,900,000
B. Reactor development				
Operating expenses.....	188,300,000	229,300,000	229,300,000	229,300,000
Construction:				
85-N-101 General plant projects	2,500,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
83-N-102 Additions to radioactive materials laboratory, Schenectady, NY.....	6,500,000	---	---	---
82-N-111 Materials facility, Savannah River, SC.....	70,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000

Departmental Administration

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1984	$359,907,000
Budget estimate, 1985	353,157,000
House allowance	351,157,000
Committee recommendation	351,157,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−2,000,000
House allowance	

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriations, 1984	$4,981,000
Budget estimate, 1985	4,877,000
House allowance	4,877,000
Committee recommendation	4,877,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends a net appropriation of $136,575,000 for departmental administration which is $2,000,000 below the budget request and the same as the House allowance.

The appropriation recommended for departmental administration supports the Department's general management, administrative, and program support functions not directly associated with program execution. The account provides for: (1) development and analysis of alternative energy policy proposals, legislation, and evaluation of DOE programs; (2) the salaries, travel, and other costs associated with the management and support of DOE; (3) the institutional relations program that provides information services and outreach activities focusing on the industrial, academic, and public communities, evaluation of energy-related inventions and support for energy training and education; (4) the performance of security investigations for persons with access to restricted atomic energy data; (5) development of international energy policy and international cooperation in energy matters; and (6) revenues from the sale of DOE products and services and their related direct costs.

The Committee provides an additional $500,000 within this account for the Office of Minority Economic Impact and commends it for the minority honors vocational training program.

The following tables show the Committee recommendations by program for new (budget) obligational authority in comparison to the current year, the budget estimate, and the House allowance.

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
81-T-112 Mods. and additions to prototype facs, various locations	24,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
Subtotal, Construction	103,000,000	48,000,000	48,000,000	48,000,000
Subtotal, Reactor development	291,300,000	277,300,000	277,300,000	277,300,000
C. Reactor operation and evaluation				
Operating expenses	112,000,000	122,000,000	122,000,000	122,000,000
E. Capital equipment	20,000,000	22,500,000	22,500,000	22,500,000
F. Program direction	10,700,000	11,200,000	11,200,000	11,200,000
Subtotal, Naval reactors development	493,000,000	496,900,000	496,900,000	496,900,000
(Operating expenses)	(370,000,000)	(426,400,000)	(426,400,000)	(426,400,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(123,000,000)	(70,500,000)	(70,500,000)	(70,500,000)
(Construction)	---	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ADP General Reduction	---	---	-7,000,000	-7,000,000
SUBTOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	6,560,770,000	7,830,375,000	7,429,451,000	7,348,601,000
(Operating expenses)	(5,094,720,000)	(5,941,144,000)	(5,782,020,000)	(5,685,270,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(1,466,050,000)	(1,889,231,000)	(1,647,431,000)	(1,663,331,000)
(Construction)	---	---	---	---
Adjustments:				
Unobli bal brought forward				
Operating expenses	---	-1,050,000	-1,050,000	-1,050,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Savings from management initiatives:				
Savings from management initiatives - AEDA (DE).....	---	-23,500,000	-23,500,000	-23,500,000
Total, Adjustments.....	---	-24,550,000	-24,550,000	-24,550,000
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES.....	6,560,770,000	7,805,825,000	7,404,901,000	7,324,051,000
(Operating expenses).....	(5,094,720,000)	(5,916,594,000)	(5,757,470,000)	(5,660,720,000)
(Plant and Capital).....	(1,466,050,000)	(1,889,231,000)	(1,647,431,000)	(1,663,331,000)
(Construction).....	---	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION				
I. Office of the Secretary - Salaries and expenses				
A. Office of the Secretary	954,000	1,051,000	1,051,000	1,051,000
C. Other expenses	348,000	579,000	579,000	579,000
Subtotal, Office of the Secretary - OE	1,302,000	1,630,000	1,630,000	1,630,000
II. General management - salaries				
A. Board of Contract Appeals	261,000	273,000	273,000	273,000
B. General Counsel	10,630,000	8,910,000	8,910,000	8,910,000
C. Inspector General	7,071,000	7,184,000	7,184,000	7,184,000
D. A/S Management & Administration	36,466,000	36,647,000	36,647,000	36,647,000
E. A/S Cons., Intergov. & Public Affairs	4,738,000	2,872,000	2,872,000	2,872,000
F. Operations Offices	57,569,000	54,250,000	54,250,000	54,250,000
G. Policy, Planning & Analysis	1,940,000	2,030,000	2,030,000	2,030,000
H. A/S International Affairs	1,872,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
I. Office of Minority Economic Impact.....	429,000	450,000	450,000	450,000
Subtotal, Salaries.....	120,976,000	114,616,000	114,616,000	114,616,000
III. General management - other expenses				
A. Other salary expenses - OE.....	8,783,000	6,333,000	6,333,000	6,333,000
B. Benefits.....	15,557,000	13,917,000	13,917,000	13,917,000
C. Travel.....	5,158,000	5,354,000	5,354,000	5,354,000
D. Services.....	110,553,000	121,049,000	121,049,000	121,049,000
E. Workmens compensation.....	1,387,000	1,582,000	1,582,000	1,582,000
F. Severence payments.....	---	---	---	---
G. Minority Economic Impact studies.....	1,100,000	1,850,000	1,850,000	1,850,000
H. Capital equipment.....	4,981,000	4,877,000	4,877,000	4,877,000
Subtotal, Other expenses.....	147,519,000	154,962,000	154,962,000	154,962,000
(Operating expenses).....	(142,538,000)	(150,085,000)	(150,085,000)	(150,085,000)
(Plant and Capital).....	(4,981,000)	(4,877,000)	(4,877,000)	(4,877,000)

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
IV. Program Support				
A. Policy analysis and system studies - OE.....	3,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
B. Intersovernmental and Institutional Relations				
1. Indian Affairs - OE.....	---	500,000	500,000	500,000
2. Consumer Affairs - OE.....	---	100,000	100,000	100,000
3. Public Affairs - Operating expenses.....	150,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
4. Competition - OE.....	---	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, Intersov, & Institutional Relations....	150,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
C. International Policy Studies - OE.....	250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000
E. Cost of work for others.....	116,191,000	115,704,000	115,704,000	115,704,000
Subtotal, Program support.....	120,091,000	122,254,000	122,254,000	122,254,000
V. Miscellaneous revenues.....	-209,619,000	-219,459,000	-219,459,000	-219,459,000

Power Marketing Administrations

Section 302(a) of Public Law 95–91 transferred to the Department of Energy the power marketing functions under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 and all other functions of the Department of the Interior with respect to the Alaska Power Administration, Bonneville Power Administration, the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, and the power marketing functions of the Bureau of Reclamation including the transmission and disposition of electric power and energy from Falcon and Amistad Dams, now included in the Western Area Power Administration.

Bonneville Power operations are self-financing under authority of the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act of 1974. The act authorizes Bonneville Power to use its revenues to finance operating costs, capital construction and to sell bonds to the Treasury if necessary to finance any remaining capital program requirements.

All other power marketing administrations are funded annually in appropriations and related receipts are deposited in the Treasury. In fiscal year 1985, these receipts are estimated by the DOE to total $732,215,000, compared to $700,551,000 in fiscal year 1984.

The Committee has become aware of increased efforts by the administration to reduce the Federal work force by contracting for services traditionally performed by Federal employees, and is concerned that undue pressure may be applied to contract essential services required for effective management of power marketing responsibilities such as setting power rates, and for operating and maintaining critical power transmission facilities.

The following table summarizes the appropriations recommended for the power marketing administrations.

Alaska Power Administration

operation and maintenance

Appropriations, 1984	$3,410,000
Budget estimate, 1985	3,233,000
House allowance	3,233,000
Committee recommendation	3,233,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

An appropriation of $3,233,000 is recommended by the Committee. This is the same as the budget request and House allowance.

The Alaska Power Administration operates, maintains, and markets power for the two Federal hydroelectric projects in Alaska, and conducts investigations of future water and power resource developments and power system studies. Program objectives include: maximizing benefits and protecting investments for the operating projects, and contributing, through the investigative programs, to use and development of renewable energy sources, such as hydroelectric, for Alaska's power needs. The State's power systems are presently dependent on oil and natural gas for over 75 percent of energy requirements; demands are increasing rapidly; and opportunities exist to shift to coal and hydroelectric resources using environmentally sound projects. Revenues from power marketing are delivered to the Treasury and are expected to total $7,215,000 in fiscal year 1985. This reflects an increase above the $6,751,000 estimate for fiscal 1984.

Bonneville Power Administration Fund

limitation on direct loans

Appropriations, 1984	($40,000,000)
Budget estimate, 1985	(40,000,000)
House allowance	(40,000,000)
Committee recommendation	(40,000,000)
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) is the Federal electric power marketing agency for the Federal Columbia River Power System (FCRPS), which consists of the hydroelectric generating facilities in the Pacific Northwest of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior (30 projects at present), plus BPA's transmission system of more than 14,000 circuit-miles of high-voltage transmission lines and 381 substations. BPA markets about one-half of the electric power produced in the Northwest and provides about four-fifths of the region's bulk electric power transmission capacity. Also, BPA markets and exchanges electric power interregionally over the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie, and in Canada over interconnections with utilities in British Columbia.

BPA operates on a self-financing basis, thus requiring no appropria-

tions. However, BPA's fiscal year 1985 budget reflects the need for borrowing authority of $371,730,000 to carry out the proposed program and new responsibilities pursuant to Public Law 96–501, the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act. BPA estimates that in addition to the $150,100,000 in borrowing authority under Public Law 96–501, there is a fiscal year 1985 requirement for new borrowing authority in the amount of $221,630,000 under Public Law 98–50.

Pacific intertie.—BPA has identified a means by which the transfer capability of the existing DC intertie can be increased by 1,100 MW through expansion of the north and south terminals. The Committee believes BPA should proceed expeditiously, in coordination with the southern terminal owners who will finance the southern terminal expansion, to increase the transfer capability of this vital facility. This terminal expansion will utilize currently unused capacity in the transmission line, making possible additional sales of surplus Pacific Northwest energy to the Pacific Southwest.

BPA's estimated total cost for the north terminal construction is $104,900,000, with budget obligations of $65,000,000 in fiscal year 1985. Accordingly, the Committee has revised the borrowing authority requirement in fiscal year 1985 by $65,000,000, increasing it from $298,700,000 to $363,700,000 in order to provide for award of material and construction contracts.

Conservation program.—The Committee is concerned that Bonneville's fiscal year 1985 budget may not be consistent with the northwest conservation and electric power plan developed by the Northwest Power Planning Council. As provided for in Public Law 96–501, the Regional Act, Bonneville shall work closely with the planning council and be guided by and act consistent with the council's plan in developing its' programs.

The Committee received testimony from the natural gas industry indicating concern over the conservation program, particularly in the commercial and industrial sectors.

In view of this testimony, the Committee reiterates the proposition that Bonneville conservation programs should not be designed for the purpose of increasing the electrical loads in the region. As provided for in the Regional Act, Bonneville shall only fund conservation programs which are cost effective and promote a reduction in electric power consumption as a result of increases in the efficiency of energy use, production, or distribution.

Fish and wildlife.—The Committee is concerned over the large proportion of funding which is contracted for fish and wildlife studies and research and, in contrast, the small amount allocated to capital investments. Although this is a relatively new program area, there appears to be a lack of focus and direction in these activities. Accordingly, the Committee recommends additional funds for capital investment in fish facilities to be allocated from within the proposed budget.

As required by Public Law 96–501, the Committee includes bill language for the five major capital investment projects proposed by the administration. These projects are Three Mile Dam fish passage facilities, Sunnyside Dam passage, Wapato Diversion Dam passage, Topenish Creek/Satus unit diversion, and Lake Pend Oreille Kokanee Hatchery. For these projects, the Committee recommends up to $8,000,000 of additional borrowing authority to expedite construction activities on these projects.

The Committee also recommends the initiation of the Umatilla Steelhead Hatchery to increase existing hatchery capacity. This action has been recommended by the Northwest Power Planning Council.

The Senate has passed S. 1027, which authorizes the construction of fish passage improvements in the Yakima River basin. The bill encompasses a carefully crafted cost-sharing arrangement among the Bonneville Power Administration, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the State of Washington. The cost-sharing arrangement envisioned by S. 1027, includes as an integral part, limitations on the sums to be expended by both Bonneville and the Bureau. While the Committee's recommendations do not prejudice in any way the final resolution of S. 1027, the Committee believes that reconciliation of the provisions of that bill would provide valuable guidance in making further allocations for the Yakima fish enhancement program.

The Committee notes that its recommendation for Bonneville included in this section and its recommendations for the Bureau contained in title II are consistent with the Senate-passed bill. Accordingly, the Committee includes funding in title II to expedite three additional fish enhancement facilities in the Yakima River basin which are recommended by the Northwest Power Planning Council. These are a third vertical slot fishway on Prosser Dam; renovation and repair of fish passage facilities at Roza Dam; and design and construction of a vertical slot fishway at Easton Dam.

The Committee will continue to review and approve expenditures by the Bonneville Power Administration for fish and wildlife programs in a careful and deliberate manner as specified under existing law.

With respect to the Mitchell Act hatchery facilities, the Committee concurs with the House position that BPA should not assume the funding responsibility pending enactment of the appropriate authorization.

Irrigation incentives.—Agriculture is one of the largest industries in the Northwest and irrigation pumping is an important end use load during the summer season. However, in 1983, BPA irrigation sales declined to approximately 75 percent of the 1979 level. The increasing cost of electricity was an important factor in this decline. To improve the viability of irrigated agriculture in the Northwest and to prevent erosion of Bonneville's revenue base, the Committee encourages special rate initiatives or other power marketing programs designed to maintain or reestablish special irrigation loads.

Bonneville has undertaken pilot studies and programs designed to assist irrigated agriculture without adversely affecting other customer

groups. The Committee recognizes these initiatives and encourages additional efforts by the Administrator.

Budget revisions.—The Committee understands the need for budget flexibility in the operations of the Bonneville Power Administration. The Federal Columbia River Transmission Act of 1974, Public Law 93–454, placed BPA on a self-financed basis and gave the agency flexibility to fulfill its regional utility objectives in a businesslike manner.

Although BPA does not require annual appropriations, the Committee, in order to carry out its oversight responsibility, believes it is important to clarify the procedure for notifying the Congress of any significant revisions in the BPA budget.

BPA is directed to fully inform the Committee of any significant new activities planned to be undertaken or any programs planned to be terminated, and to provide the Committee prior notification of any change in the planned use of borrowing authority amounting to more than 10 percent of any major program area.

The recommended limitation on direct loans is the same as recommended by the administration and the House. BPA indicates that this level is adequate to carry out its responsibilities as required by law.

Southeastern Power Administration

Operation and Maintenance

Appropriations, 1984	$20,594,000
Budget estimate, 1985	35,744,000
House allowance	35,744,000
Committee recommendation	35,744,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $35,744,000, which is the same as the budget request and House allowance.

The Southeastern Power Administration (SEPA) markets hydroelectric power produced at Federal projects located in 10 Southeastern States in accordance with policy directives contained in section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944. The States include Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Florida, and Mississippi.

Southwestern Power Administration

Operation and Maintenance

Appropriations, 1984	$36,229,000
Budget estimate, 1985	29,208,000
House allowance	31,208,000
Committee recommendation	31,208,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+2,000,000
House allowance	

The Committee recommends concurrence with the House allowance of $31,208,000.

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ADP General Reduction	---	---	-2,000,000	-2,000,000
Savings from management initiatives-(M&A) DA	---	-6,000,000	-6,000,000	-6,000,000
Savings from FY84 initiatives	---	-375,000	-375,000	-375,000
Continuing resolution unapplied (PACE)	---	---	---	---
FY 1983 deferred balances carried forward	-25,000,000	---	---	---
FY 1984 deferred balances carried forward	---	-29,053,000	-29,053,000	-29,053,000
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION	155,269,000	138,575,000	136,575,000	136,575,000
(Operating expenses)	(359,907,000)	(353,157,000)	(351,157,000)	(351,157,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(4,981,000)	(4,877,000)	(4,877,000)	(4,877,000)
(Miscellaneous revenues)	(-209,619,000)	(-219,459,000)	(-219,459,000)	(-219,459,000)

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE				
I. Power marketing - Alaska Power Administration				
A. Operating expenses	3,210,000	3,233,000	3,233,000	3,233,000
B. Emergency fund	200,000	---	---	---
TOTAL ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION	3,410,000	3,233,000	3,233,000	3,233,000
BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION				
I. Power marketing - Bonneville Administration	123,400,000	---	---	---
(Permanent indefinite borrowing authorty)	(283,285,000)	(298,730,000)	(363,730,000)	(371,730,000)
TOTAL BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION	123,400,000	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE				
I. Power marketing - Southeastern power administration				
A. Operating and maintenance	1,751,000	1,904,000	1,904,000	1,904,000
B. Purchase power and wheeling	18,843,000	33,840,000	33,840,000	33,840,000
TOTAL SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	20,594,000	35,744,000	35,744,000	35,744,000
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE				
I. Power marketing - Southwestern Power Administration				
A. Operation and maintenance	9,800,000	10,168,000	12,168,000	12,168,000
B. Purchase power and wheeling	22,729,000	22,400,000	22,400,000	22,400,000
C. Construction	3,700,000	3,700,000	3,700,000	3,700,000
Savings from management initiatives	---	-60,000	-60,000	-60,000
Use of prior year balances	---	-7,000,000	-7,000,000	-7,000,000
TOTAL SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	36,229,000	29,208,000	31,208,000	31,208,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION - CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE				
I. Power marketing - Western Area Power Administration				
A. Construction and rehabilitation.....	78,767,000	83,330,000	83,330,000	83,330,000
B. System operation and maintenance.....	72,863,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000
C. Purchase power and wheeling.....	68,000,000	90,000,000	90,000,000	90,000,000
Unobligated balances.....	-25,000,000	---	-30,000,000	---
Savings from management initiatives-(WAPA).....	---	-100,000	-100,000	-100,000
TOTAL WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION.....	194,630,000	248,230,000	218,230,000	248,230,000
EMERGENCY FUND - WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION				
I. Emergency fund.....	500,000	---	---	---
TOTAL WESTERN AREA POWER ADMIN EMERGENCY FUND.....	500,000	---	---	---

The Southwestern Power Administration (SWPA) is the marketing agent for the disposal of power and energy generated at U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' hydroelectric plants in the six-State area of Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Missouri, Arkansas, and Louisiana. It is headquartered in Tulsa, Okla., with an operation control center located in Springfield, Mo., and maintenance crews and support warehouses located in Muskogee and Ada, Okla.; Jonesboro, Ark.; and Springfield, Mo.

The SWPA provides transmission lines, substations, switching stations, and communication facilities for integration and optimal distribution of electricity from hydroelectric projects for transmission and sale of power to geographically dispersed customers.

The SWPA schedules and controls the generation of power from 23 hydroelectric projects to 65 contracts from 59 system interconnection points with publicly and privately owned utilities. In addition, the SWPA operates and maintains 1,665 miles of transmission lines consisting of 161kV, 138kV and 69kV wood pole and steel construction. It performs maintenance on 20 radio and microwave stations, 34 switching stations and substations, with a total installed capacity of 2,089,000 kVA.

Western loop transmission lines.—The Committee is aware that for the last several years only minimal maintenance has been performed on the SWPA transmission lines known as the "western loop" in anticipation of the sale of those lines. The Committee is concerned about the condition of the lines, and therefore, directs SWPA to proceed with necessary maintenance and upgrading to assure SWPA will be able to provide adequate service. An increase of $2,000,000 is provided for this purpose.

Western Area Power Administration

Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance

Appropriations, 1984	$194,630,000
Budget estimate, 1985	248,230,000
House allowance	218,230,000
Committee recommendation	248,230,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	+30,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $248,230,000, the same as the budget request.

The Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance program of the Western Area Power Administration (WAPA), excluding the Colorado River storage project and Fort Peck project, involves marketing federally generated hydroelectric power within a 15-State area in the West.

Western is responsible for the operation and maintenance of about 16,000 miles of transmission lines and over 200 substations. Electric power marketed by Western is generated by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and the International Boundary and Water

Commission in Texas, all of which operate some 49 hydropower generating plants in Western's service area with a current installed generating capacity of 8,466,353 kilowatts.

Fallon geothermal projects.—The Committee recommends concurrence with the House provision establishing a revolving fund to cover those costs incurred by Western as a result of its involvement in the Department of the Navy's geothermal resource projects.

Charges for power sold to Navy or DOD facilities in Western's marketing area will include the purchase of electricity from the Navy's contractors, Navy's cost of administering its contracts, and Western's administrative and other costs necessary to deliver the power.

In addition, there will be design, construction, operation, maintenance, and replacement costs associated with transmission lines connecting the project with the most appropriate and feasible integrated utility grids. It is intended that repayment costs for the lines, as well as all other associated Western costs, will be covered from the revolving fund for the projects on a self-financing basis.

Pacific intertie.—The Committee is concerned with the lack of progress in increasing the capacity of the transmission of electrical power from the Northwest. WAPA is directed to cooperate with BPA in expediting necessary action to secure the necessary transmitting capacity. Accordingly, the Committee has included bill language contained in the House measure giving the Secretary the necessary authority to cooperate with regional utilities in constructing additional intertie capacity.

Should such improvements include using facilities which are presently part of the Federal Central Valley Project power system, WAPA shall retain an appropriate share, as determined by the Administrator, of these facilities as fair compensation for their value. Such share, not to exceed 50 percent of the total uprated capacity, shall be used to serve the needs of existing Government customers of WAPA.

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1984	$89,582,000
Budget estimate, 1985	100,677,000
House allowance	95,677,000
Committee recommendation	95,677,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−5,000,000
House allowance	

REVENUES APPLIED

Revenues applied, 1984	−$45,100,000
Budget estimate, 1985	−60,000,000
House allowance	−60,000,000
Committee recommendation	−60,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 1984	$44,482,000
Budget estimate, 1985	40,677,000
House allowance	35,677,000
Committee recommendation	35,677,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−5,000,000
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $95,677,000, the same as the House allowance.

Section 204 and title IV of Public Law 95–91, the Department of Energy Organization Act, established within the Department of Energy the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to carry out functions transferred from the Federal Power Commission for hydroelectric, electric utility, and natural gas regulation and from the Interstate Commerce Commission for oil pipeline regulation.

The act sets out the clear intent of Congress that the Commission be independent from supervision or direction from any other officer of the Department, but provides that the Secretary shall provide to the Commission such support and facilities as the Commission determines it needs to carry out its functions. This support includes services for personnel, accounting, facilities support, computer operations, procurement, and other similar services funded elsewhere in the Departmental request.

The Committee recommendation for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) provides for a program level of $95,677,000 of which $60,000,000 would be derived from user fee revenues and $35,677,000 would be new budget (obligational) authority.

Productivity improvement.—The Committee is concerned about the need for improved productivity in FERC. In order to encourage improved productivity, the Committee is recommending a general reduction of $5,000,000 with the intention that FERC streamline and focus its operations, establish priorities based on a rational energy policy, and eliminate unnecessary and redundant activities.

Hydropower regulation.—The Committee is aware that the city of Bend, Oreg., and Deschutes County, Oreg., have adopted ordinances requiring completion of a comprehensive instream flow study prior to licensing of any hydroelectric power development projects on the upper Deschutes River basin. The county is currently proceeding with its study and has requested that FERC cooperate and refrain from taking action on pending applications for projects affected by the city and

county ordinances. The Committee feels these local governments have taken a responsible approach to a difficult issue and that FERC should comply with their requests.

The following table summarizes the Committee action:

GEOTHERMAL RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT FUND

GEOTHERMAL LOAN GUARANTEE AND INTEREST ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1984	$2,100,000
Budget estimate, 1985	121,000
House allowance	121,000
Committee recommendation	121,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $121,000. This is the same as the budget request and the same as the House allowance.

The geothermal loan guarantee and interest assistance program is authorized under the Geothermal Energy Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–410), as amended by the Department of Energy Act of 1978—Civilian Applications (Public Law 95–238).

The purpose of the program is to accelerate the commercial development and utilization of geothermal energy. Loan guarantees approved under this program are expected to achieve (1) development of normal borrower-lender relationships which, through experience, will encourage the flow of credit without further dependence on Federal financial assistance and (2) enhanced competition to encourage new contracts into the geothermal market.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1984	$2,700,000
Budget estimate, 1985	
House allowance	2,700,000
Committee recommendation	1,700,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+1,700,000
House allowance	−1,000,000

An appropriation of $1,700,000 is recommended for salaries and expenses of the Appalachian Regional Commission. This is $1,000,000 below the amount recommended by the House.

The salaries and expenses appropriation finances the full cost of the Federal cochairman and his immediate staff and 40 percent of the administrative expenses of the Commission.

The Committee recommendation includes adjustments for anticipated efficiencies, application of prior-year funding, and the phasing down of the Appalachian development programs. The action recommended also anticipates the 13 Appalachian States will assume a greater portion of the Commission's administrative budget as the Federal role is reduced.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 1984	$154,400,000
Budget estimate, 1985	[1] 80,000,000
House allowance	157,300,000
Committee recommendation	118,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+38,000,000
House allowance	−39,300,000

[1] Included under Department of Transportation, "Federal Highway Administration."

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $118,000,000 for the Appalachian Regional Development programs, including the full budget request of $80,000,000 for the Appalachian development highway program. This is $38,000,000 over the budget request for 1985.

As in the past years, the administration has requested funding only for the Appalachian highways program under the Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration. Three years ago, Congress agreed to begin a phasedown of programs under the Appalachian Regional Commission over a 3- to 5-year period. Funding has remained

relatively level over the 3 years, the Committee continues to believe that a refocusing of ARC activities is needed.

Much has been accomplished under the guidance of the ARC. The Appalachia of today has changed significantly since the 1960's. Despite this progress, some Appalachia areas still lag behind the rest of the country. With disproportionate dependence on manufacturing and mining, Appalachia faces severe problems with structural unemployment and foreign competition. The recent recession, from which the fragile economy of the region is slowly emerging, has resulted in unemployment rates in some areas consistently one-third or more above the national average. Recognizing improvements in the Appalachian region, the Committee over the past 3 years has sought to focus the Federal dollars on those activities which offer the greatest impact in the poorest areas, contribute to the completion of the Commission's health activities, including the reduction of infant mortality, and most directly contribute to increased employment. The Committee reaffirms the action it took last year and agrees that $15,000,000 of area development funds should be spent on projects in distressed counties as previously proposed by the region's Governors.

In an effort to insure maximum effectiveness and an orderly phasedown of ARC programs, the Committee directs that not to exceed 50 percent of the total cost of an activity be financed by ARC, except in distressed counties; and encourages the initiation of only those projects where funds can be expended within 1 year.

The Committee views with concern the House Committee directions for the ARC to earmark funds for specific purposes. The Committee wishes to emphasize that each State receives an allocation of funds from which it is free to set its own priorities. This procedure has worked well over the years and it is critical, during the phasedown of ARC activities, that each State be able to plan on receiving its appropriate allocation from the total area development funds. Earmarking of funds, as the House has done, is unfair to the other Appalachian States. The Committee has no objection to the States using their normal allocation for the work identified in the House report.

The importance of the highway program to the continued improvement of the quality of life in Appalachia cannot be overemphasized. Recent studies indicate that 60 percent of new manufacturing plants located in the region since 1965 are within 30 minutes of existing or planned Appalachian development highway system corridors, and that more than 400,000 jobs have been created along these corridors. The Committee expects that funds appropriated for Appalachian highways be applied to construction of those segments in the Commission approved finish-up program. Because of the potential benefits created by the Appalachian highway program, the Committee feels that special emphasis should be given to those projects located in distressed counties. The Committee cautions the States that prefinancing is undertaken with no formal commitment of future reimbursement.

The recommended amounts are shown in the following table:

[In thousands of dollars]

	1984 appropriation	1985 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Appalachian highways	109,400	80,000	100,000	80,000
Area development programs	40,000		57,300	35,000
Local development districts and technical assistance	5,000			3,000
Total appropriation	154,400	80,000	157,300	118,000
Total program	154,400	80,000	157,300	118,000

Delaware River Basin Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1984	$191,000
Budget estimate, 1985	172,000
House allowance	172,000
Committee recommendation	172,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee concurs with the House allowance of $172,000, the same as the budget request.

This appropriation provides the full budget estimate for salaries and expenses of the U.S. Commissioner and his staff in representing interests of the Federal Government in the Delaware River Basin Commission.

CONTRIBUTION TO DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Appropriations, 1984	$269,000
Budget estimate, 1985	283,000
House allowance	283,000
Committee recommendation	283,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $283,000, which is the same as the budget request.

This appropriation provides for the Federal share of the annual expenses of the Commission.

Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin

Contribution to Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin

Appropriations, 1984	$68,000
Budget estimate, 1985	
House allowance	70,000
Committee recommendation	70,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+70,000
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $70,000 for the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin.

The Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin was created in 1940 by compact among the four States in the basin, Maryland, Virginia, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia, plus the District of Columbia and Federal Government. The Commission has the responsibility for basinwide water quality, planning, program coordination and assistance.

Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Salaries and Expenses

Appropriations, 1984	$465,800,000
Budget estimate, 1985	468,200,000
House allowance	438,200,000
Committee recommendation	458,200,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−10,000,000
House allowance	+20,000,000

An appropriation of $458,200,000 is recommended by the Committee. This is $20,000,000 over the House allowance and $7,600,000 below the current year level of funding.

The Committee recognizes the critical importance of the nuclear regulatory program, including the need to assure the protection of the public health and safety. Although there has been no significant decline in licensing activities, the Committee recommends a general reduction of $10,000,000 to the fiscal year 1985 NRC budget. Within this amount, the Committee expects the Commission to maintain ongoing research and development activities and plans established as of January 1, 1984. This funding level will provide for necessary expenses of the Commission in carrying out the purposes of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 and the Atomic Energy Act, as amended.

The Committee provides $168,415,000 for nuclear regulatory research activities, the amount requested in the budget, but $19,000,000 below the current year. The Committee is concerned that, within this allocation, sufficient funding be provided for completion of phase I activities at the Power Burst Facility (PBF), and for dismantlement and disassembly of the PBF facility, following completion of all future anticipated experimentation within this facility.

In utilizing the funds appropriated for review of emergency preparedness of civilian nuclear powerplants, NRC shall, in connection with licensing decisions and in consultations with the Federal Emergency

Management Agency, determine those discrepancies which are easily correctable and not of substantial import to the public health and safety and distinguish them from those discrepancies which are both not susceptable of ready resolution by the utility and are of substantial importance to the protection of the public health and safety. It shall then issue such regulations as may be necessary to allow appropriate action to be taken to license plants while protecting the public health and safety.

Susquehanna River Basin Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1984	$191,000
Budget estimate, 1985	167,000
House allowance	167,000
Committee recommendation	167,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends $167,000 for salaries and expenses of the Susquehanna River Basin Commission, which is the same as the House allowance.

The Susquehanna River Basin Commission was created by compact (Public Law 91–575) among the States of Maryland and New York, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the Federal Government to enable them to participate jointly in the development of water and related resources of the region drained by the Susquehanna River and its tributaries.

This appropriation provides for the expenses of the U.S. Commissioner and his staff.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Appropriations, 1984	$230,000
Budget estimate, 1985	230,000
House allowance	230,000
Committee recommendation	230,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $230,000 which is the same as the House allowance and budget request.

This appropriation provides for the Federal share of the annual expenses of the Commission. The compact provides that the amount required to balance the Commission's current expenses budget shall be apportioned equitably among the signatory parties by unanimous vote of the Commission. The amount recommended for the Federal contribution is $230,000 of a current expenses budget for 1985 of $1,465,300.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION				
I. Oil pipeline regulation	5,237,000	5,825,000	5,825,000	5,825,000
II. Natural gas regulation				
A. Pipeline certificate regulation	14,948,000	16,789,000	16,789,000	16,789,000
B. Pipeline rate regulation	17,158,000	19,073,000	19,073,000	19,073,000
C. Producer certificate regulation	2,178,000	2,433,000	2,433,000	2,433,000
D. Producer rate regulation	2,333,000	2,607,000	2,607,000	2,607,000
E. Wellhead pricing	6,960,000	7,734,000	7,734,000	7,734,000
Subtotal, Natural gas regulation	43,577,000	48,636,000	48,636,000	48,636,000
III. Hydropower licensing	23,109,000	26,120,000	26,120,000	26,120,000
IV. Electric power regulation	17,659,000	20,096,000	20,096,000	20,096,000
General Reduction	---	---	-5,000,000	-5,000,000
SUBTOTAL, FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION	89,582,000	100,677,000	95,677,000	95,677,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Adjustments:				
Less offsetting revenues	-45,100,000	-60,000,000	-60,000,000	-60,000,000
Total, adjustments	-45,100,000	-60,000,000	-60,000,000	-60,000,000
TOTAL, FERC AFTER REVENUES	44,482,000	40,677,000	35,677,000	35,677,000

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

PAYMENT TO TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND

Appropriations, 1984	[1] $85,629,000
Budget estimate, 1985	115,308,000
House allowance	126,308,000
Committee recommendation	115,308,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	−11,000,000

[1] Does not include $47,271,000 of deferred prior year appropriations.

The Committee recommendation for the Tennessee Valley Authority totals $129,547,000. The new appropriation recommended is $29,679,000 over the appropriations enacted for the current year.

Regional water management.—The Committee is aware of some potentially serious water quality and resource problems in the Tennessee Valley area which could limit the economic progress in that region. To respond to this problem, the Committee has added $3,200,000 over the budget request.

In order to augment TVA's water quality activities, the Committee has provided an additional $2,700,000 for important work at Cherokee and Boone reservoirs and water quality studies in north Alabama. The Committee recommendation also includes $500,000 to implement corrective actions to reduce sources of bacteria in the Bear Creek floatway; and $500,000 to assist local communities with drought-related water supply and conservation problems.

Finally, the Committee has provided an additional $500,000 for reservoir release improvements of oxygen-depleted water from TVA facilities and control of aquatic weeds.

Special opportunities counties and cities.—Based on the strong testimony and response to questions, the Committee has provided $7,095,000 for the special opportunities counties and cities program. The Committee believes that greater attention and focus needs to be given to the poorest valley areas. With these additional funds more extensive program activities can be undertaken in both current and new areas creating an estimated 1,200 to 1,500 jobs and $20,000,000 in new private sector investment.

North Alabama coal gasification plant.—For the past 3 years, the Committee has been concerned with the TVA's progress in attracting additional equity partners to help finance the Murphy Hill coal gasification project in north Alabama. While TVA remains supportive of the technology and need for such a plant, it has been unable to attract additional private investors necessary to warrant continued activity.

In the 1984 Energy and Water Appropriation Bill, the Committee asked TVA to make a final recommendation on the project. Again in hearings on the 1985 budget, the Committee asked for the Board's judgment regarding continued expenditures. While supporting the need for a synthetic fuels program, no final recommendation on project continuation was offered.

Therefore, the Committee urges TVA to move immediately to complete the preliminary design work on the project and expects that no new activities will be initiated. Negotiations with SFC and the private sector consortium may continue.

Columbia Dam and Reservoir, Tenn.—The Columbia Dam project has been under construction since 1973. The project is approximately 45 percent complete, with the concrete portion of the dam virtually built.

In 1982, TVA, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Columbia Dam Coordinating Committee agreed to a conservation program to preserve certain freshwater mussels which had been listed as endangered under the provisions of section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Further construction on the project was halted in September 1983 pending a determination by the Fish and Wildlife Service that there would be "likely success" of the mussel protection program.

Four thousand mussels have been transplanted in four streams to measure their reproductiion and survivability rates in habitats other than the Duck River. Testimony by TVA indicates the transplant program has, thus far, produced mixed results.

The Committee remains concerned that this project, initially approved in 1969 and funded by the Congress for 11 years continues to be the subject of serious delays which increase the ultimate cost of completion. Project supporters have indicated that TVA has failed to act in good faith to assure the successful completion of the mussel protection program.

Since any further construction will depend on the outcome of the mussel conservation program, the Committee directs TVA, as it has in previous years, to press for the successful completion of the mussel conservation program.

Program financing and transfer authority.—The Committee has been concerned for the last several years about the large carryforward balances from TVA's appropriated budget. While the Committee understands that a large part of this amount is for projects initiated and supported by Congress, stringent budget conditions make it necessary to use unobligated balances in the most efficient and effective manner. The Committee also reaffirms the policy of using funds from projects that are experiencing nonfunding delays as sources of transfer. Therefore, the recommendation applies $7,239,000 of unobligated balances, including $3,239,000 from TVA's coal gasification plant, and $4,000,000 of savings realized from the new Pickwick lock construction to offset the 1985 funding requirements.

In order to strengthen the procedures instituted by the Committees last year regarding transfer and reprograming of funds, the Committee delegates to TVA authority to transfer not to exceed 20 percent of the funds appropriated for the fiscal year for activities up to $100,000.

For activities over $100,000, TVA may transfer not to exceed 10 percent of the funds appropriated for that fiscal year. Transfers in excess of the 10 percent delegated to the agency shall be approved in advance by the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate. Whenever

the sum of change to activities comprising a program will increase or decrease that program by more than 15 percent, or for increases or decreases in excess of those other thresholds outlined above, advance approval by the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate is required.

In addition, the Committee action recommends small reductions from several budgeted programs to bring those activities into line with current funding levels and to focus ongoing work.

The following table shows the allocation of the funds recommended for activities under this heading:

RECOMMENDED APPROPRIATION

[In thousands of dollars]

	1984 allocation	1985 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
CAPITAL INVESTMENT				
NATURAL RESOURCES				
Water resources:				
New lock at Pickwick Landing Dam	21,000	[1]7,000	[1]7,000	[1]7,000
Dam safety modifications		5,000	5,000	5,000
Additions and improvements	3,015	2,619	2,619	2,619
Total, water resources	24,015	14,619	14,619	14,619
Land and forest resources:				
Recreation resources development facilities	100	110	110	110
Land Between the Lakes facilities	190	90	90	90
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY RESOURCES				
Community resources:				
Local flood damage prevention projects	610	180	180	180
NATIONAL FERTILIZER DEVELOPMENT				
Chemical facilities:				
Railroad tank car replacements	590			
Water pollution control facilities	500	407	407	407
Fluid fertilizer storage facilities	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500
Energy-efficient fertilizer process	1,100	1,760	1,760	1,760
Granular urea-urea phosphate		400	400	400
Optimize ammonia plant	770	863	863	
Replacements, improvements, and pollution abatement and support facilities	1,482	1,024	1,024	1,024
Total, chemical facilities	6,530	5,954	5,954	5,091
Ammonia-from-coal project	297	316	316	316

See footnotes at end of table.

RECOMMENDED APPROPRIATION–Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	1984 allocation	1985 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
GENERAL SERVICES				
General facilities	3,013	2,691	2,691	2,691
Total, capital investment	34,755	23,960	23,960	23,097
EXPENSES				
NATURAL RESOURCES				
Water resources:				
Regional water management	1,304	2,350	4,450	4,550
Reservoir releases improvements	1,058	1,125	1,125	1,625
Fisheries resources development	558	590	590	590
Total, water resources	2,920	4,065	6,165	6,765
Reservoir system operations:				
Navigation operations	1,110	1,386	1,386	1,386
Flood hazard analysis	512	545	545	545
Multipurpose reservoir operations:				
Water control operations	2,062	2,193	2,193	2,193
Reservoir ecology	1,893	2,272	2,272	2,272
Plant protection and services to visitors	2,972	3,075	3,075	3,075
Dam safety analysis	1,020	1,220	1,220	1,220
Reservoir lands planning	597	635	635	635
Dam reservation operation and maintenance	2,555	2,673	2,673	2,673
Reservoir land management	3,922	4,140	4,140	4,140
Maintenance of structures and equipment, and improvements	2,847	3,326	3,326	3,326
Total, reservoir system operations	19,490	21,465	21,465	21,465
Land and forest resources:				
Forest resources	1,723	2,335	2,335	2,000
Wildlife resources	950	940	940	940
Recreation resources	[2]8,261	890	890	890
Environmental/energy education	525	660	660	390
Total, land and forest resources	11,459	4,825	4,825	4,220
Resource management and development support:				
Valley mapping and remote sensing	1,080	1,100	1,100	1,100
Regional air management	664	700	700	700
Conservation of public lands and waters	797	945	945	845
Total, resource management and development support	2,541	2,745	2,745	2,645

See footnotes at end of table.

RECOMMENDED APPROPRIATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	1984 allocation	1985 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Land Between the Lakes operations	6,705	7,160	7,160	7,160
Total, natural resources	43,115	40,260	42,360	42,255
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY RESOURCES				
Economic resources:				
Navigation development	1,390	1,150	1,150	2,650
Economic development and analysis	2,460	3,285	5,385	3,000
Minority economic development	770	770	1,770	770
Special opportunities counties and cities	2,365	2,095	6,095	7,095
Skills development	4,075	2,000	3,500	2,000
Total, economic resources	11,060	9,300	17,900	15,515
Community resources:				
Community preparedness	1,380	1,250	1,250	1,250
Townlift	800	500	500	500
Regional waste and water supply	900	1,500	2,000	1,000
Floodplain management	1,600	2,050	2,050	1,750
Total, community resources	4,680	5,300	5,800	4,500
Total, economic and community resources	15,740	14,600	23,700	20,015
Agricultural resources development	4,055	5,525	5,675	5,525
NATIONAL FERTILIZER DEVELOPMENT				
Fertilizer R&D	13,683	14,772	14,772	14,772
Fertilizer introduction	12,059	12,756	12,756	12,756
Total, national fertilizer development	25,742	27,528	27,528	27,528
Ammonia from coal	6,025	6,417	6,417	6,417
Hardwood fuels research	2,873	5,560	5,560	4,060
Fort Payne, Ala., power line relocation			500	
General services	595	650	650	650
Total, expenses	98,145	100,540	112,390	106,450
Total, program	132,900	124,500	136,350	129,547
FINANCING SUMMARY				
Appropriations (new budget authority)	85,629	115,308	126,308	115,308
Deferred appropriation	47,271	9,192	9,192	7,000
Application of anticipated unobligated carryover balances			850	7,239
Total, appropriations	132,900	124,500	136,350	129,547

[1] These funds, deferred to 1985 from prior year appropriations, will complete construction of the new lock at Pickwick Landing Dam in fiscal year 1985.

[2] The estimate includes a one-time appropriation of $7,400,000 for recreation development on the Ocoee River.

BUDGETARY IMPACT OF BILL

PREPARED BY THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE PURSUANT TO SEC. 308(a), PUBLIC LAW 93-344

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority		Outlays	
	Committee allocation	Amount in bill	Committee allocation	Amount in bill
Comparison of amounts in the bill with the Committee allocation to its subcommittees of amounts in the First Concurrent Resolution for 1985: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development	N/A	15,371	N/A	[1]15,294
Projections of outlays associated with budget authority recommended in the bill:				
1985				[2]7,562
1986				6,357
1987				1,240
1988				211
1989 and future year				0
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 1985 in the bill		118		6

[1] Includes outlays from prior-year budget authority.
[2] Excludes outlays from prior-year budget authority.
N/A: Not applicable.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1984 AND THE BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1985

[Becomes available automatically under earlier, or "permanent" law without further, or annual, action by the Congress. Thus, these amounts are not included in the accompanying bill.]

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, 1984	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, 1985	Increase or decrease
PERMANENT NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY			
FEDERAL FUNDS			
Corps of Engineers—Civil: Permanent appropriations	$7,700,000	$8,000,000	+$300,000
Department of the Interior: Bureau of Reclamation: Miscellaneous appropriations	2,700,000	2,500,000	-200,000
Department of Energy: Payments to States under Federal Power Act	570,000	570,000	
Bonneville Power Administration Fund (authority to borrow)	283,285,000	298,730,000	+15,445,000
Tennessee Valley Authority Fund (authority to borrow)	464,367,000	357,065,000	-107,302,000
Total, permanent new budget (obligational) authority, Federal funds	758,622,000	666,865,000	-91,757,000
TRUST FUNDS			
Rivers and harbors contributed funds	51,000,000	52,000,000	+1,000,000
Department of the Interior: Reclamation trust funds	16,920,000	15,350,000	-1,570,000
Department of Energy: Advances for cooperative work	32,205,000	18,460,000	-13,745,000
Appalachian Regional Commission: Miscellaneous trust fund accounts	4,500,000		-4,500,000
Total, permanent new budget (obligational) authority, trust funds	104,625,000	85,810,000	-18,815,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1984 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1985

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1984 Appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)		
					1984 Appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL							
Department of the Army							
Corps of Engineers - Civil							
General investigations	133,810,000	118,000,000	151,851,000	125,639,000	-8,171,000	+7,639,000	-26,212,000
Construction, general	894,104,000	874,000,000	933,014,000	871,780,000	-22,324,000	-2,220,000	-61,234,000
Flood control and coastal emergencies	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	30,000,000	+20,000,000	+20,000,000	+20,000,000
Revolving Fund	9,500,000	---	---	---	-9,500,000	---	---
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	300,480,000	304,000,000	326,309,000	310,300,000	+9,820,000	+6,300,000	-16,009,000
Operation and maintenance, general	1,184,492,000	1,297,000,000	1,339,683,000	1,317,557,000	+133,065,000	+20,557,000	-22,126,000
General expenses	103,000,000	113,000,000	113,000,000	108,150,000	+5,150,000	-4,850,000	-4,850,000
Special recreation use fees	6,000,000	---	---	---	-6,000,000	---	---
Administrative provisions (limitation on capital expenditures)	(78,000,000)	---	---	---	(-78,000,000)	---	---
Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil:							
New budget (obligational) authority	2,641,384,000	2,716,000,000	2,873,857,000	2,763,426,000	+122,040,000	+47,426,000	-110,431,000
(Limitation on capital expenditures)	(78,000,000)	---	---	---	(-78,000,000)	---	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1984 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1985—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1984 Appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)		
					1984 Appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR							
Bureau of Reclamation							
General investigations	33,831,000	35,651,000	35,566,000	31,023,000	-2,808,000	-4,628,000	-4,543,000
Construction program	695,318,000	764,137,000	707,817,000	752,397,000	+57,079,000	-11,740,000	+44,580,000
Operation and maintenance	134,291,000	149,689,000	149,689,000	149,689,000	+15,398,000	---	---
Loan program	45,000,000	67,537,000	72,037,000	67,537,000	+22,537,000	---	-4,500,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(51,802,000)	(66,000,000)	(70,500,000)	(68,500,000)	(+16,698,000)	(+2,500,000)	(-2,000,000)
General administrative expenses	53,750,000	58,917,000	58,917,000	56,350,000	+2,600,000	-2,567,000	-2,567,000
Emergency Fund	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	---	---	---
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	963,190,000	1,076,931,000	1,025,026,000	1,057,996,000	+94,806,000	-18,935,000	+32,970,000
Total, title II, Department of the Interior:							
New budget (obligational) authority	963,190,000	1,076,931,000	1,025,026,000	1,057,996,000	+94,806,000	-18,935,000	+32,970,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(51,802,000)	(66,000,000)	(70,500,000)	(68,500,000)	(+16,698,000)	(+2,500,000)	(-2,000,000)
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY							
Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities:							
Operating Expenses	1,744,989,000	1,792,578,000	1,664,914,000	1,740,633,000	-4,356,000	-51,945,000	+75,719,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	245,947,000	249,535,000	261,235,000	245,535,000	-412,000	-4,000,000	-15,700,000
Subtotal	1,990,936,000	2,042,113,000	1,926,149,000	1,986,168,000	-4,768,000	-55,945,000	+60,019,000

Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities:							
Operating Expenses	1,573,038,000	1,265,900,000	1,254,900,000	1,265,900,000	-307,138,000	---	+11,000,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	620,772,000	409,400,000	395,400,000	409,400,000	-211,372,000	---	+14,000,000
Subtotal	2,193,810,000	1,675,300,000	1,650,300,000	1,675,300,000	-518,510,000	---	+25,000,000
Gross revenues	-2,105,000,000	-1,675,300,000	-1,650,300,000	-1,675,300,000	+429,700,000	---	-25,000,000
Net appropriation	88,810,000	---	---	---	-88,810,000	---	---
General Science and Research Activities:							
Operating Expenses	478,750,000	527,705,000	518,205,000	518,205,000	+39,455,000	-9,500,000	---
Plant and Capital Equipment	162,500,000	218,400,000	208,700,000	208,700,000	+46,200,000	-9,700,000	---
Subtotal	641,250,000	746,105,000	726,905,000	726,905,000	+85,655,000	-19,200,000	---
Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund	319,621,000	327,669,000	327,669,000	327,669,000	+8,048,000	---	---
Atomic Energy Defense Activites:							
Operating Expenses	5,094,720,000	5,916,594,000	5,757,470,000	5,660,720,000	+566,000,000	-255,874,000	-96,750,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	1,466,050,000	1,889,231,000	1,647,431,000	1,663,331,000	+197,281,000	-225,900,000	+15,900,000
Subtotal	6,560,770,000	7,805,825,000	7,404,901,000	7,324,051,000	+763,281,000	-481,774,000	-80,850,000
Departmental Administration:							
Operating Expenses	359,907,000	353,157,000	351,157,000	351,157,000	-8,750,000	-2,000,000	---
Plant and Capital Equipment	4,981,000	4,877,000	4,877,000	4,877,000	-104,000	---	---
Subtotal	364,888,000	358,034,000	356,034,000	356,034,000	-8,854,000	-2,000,000	---
Miscellaneous revenues	-209,619,000	-219,459,000	-219,459,000	-219,459,000	-9,840,000	---	---
Net appropriation	155,269,000	138,575,000	136,575,000	136,575,000	-18,694,000	-2,000,000	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1984 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1985—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1984 Appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)		
					1984 Appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Power Marketing Administrations							
Operation and maintenance, Alaska Power Administration	3,410,000	3,233,000	3,233,000	3,233,000	-177,000	---	---
Bonneville Power Administration Fund:							
Borrowing Authority	123,400,000	---	---	---	-123,400,000	---	---
(Limitation on direct loans)	(40,000,000)	(40,000,000)	(40,000,000)	(40,000,000)	---	---	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(20,000,000)	---	---	---	(-20,000,000)	---	---
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	20,594,000	35,744,000	35,744,000	35,744,000	+15,150,000	---	---
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	36,229,000	29,208,000	31,208,000	31,208,000	-5,021,000	+2,000,000	---
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	194,630,000	248,230,000	218,230,000	248,230,000	+53,600,000	---	+30,000,000
Emergency Fund, Western Area Power Administration	500,000	---	---	---	-500,000	---	---
Subtotal	378,763,000	316,415,000	288,415,000	318,415,000	-60,348,000	+2,000,000	+30,000,000
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission							
Salaries and expenses	89,582,000	100,677,000	95,677,000	95,677,000	+6,095,000	-5,000,000	---
Revenues Applied	-45,100,000	-60,000,000	-60,000,000	-60,000,000	-14,900,000	---	---
Subtotal	44,482,000	40,677,000	35,677,000	35,677,000	-8,805,000	-5,000,000	---

Geothermal Resources Development Fund							
Geothermal loan guarantee and interest assistance program	2,100,000	121,000	121,000	121,000	-1,979,000	---	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	---	---	---
Total, title III, Department of Energy:							
New budget (obligational) authority	10,182,001,000	11,417,500,000	10,846,412,000	10,855,581,000	+673,580,000	-561,919,000	+9,169,000
Operating Expenses	(7,681,751,000)	(8,646,057,000)	(8,328,769,000)	(8,323,738,000)	(+641,987,000)	(-322,319,000)	(-5,031,000)
Plant and Capital Equipment	(2,500,250,000)	(2,771,443,000)	(2,517,643,000)	(2,531,843,000)	(+31,593,000)	(-239,600,000)	(+14,200,000)
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES							
Appalachian Regional Commission: Salaries and Expenses	2,700,000	---	2,700,000	1,700,000	-1,000,000	+1,700,000	-1,000,000
Funds Appropriated to the President:							
Appalachian regional development programs	54,400,000	---	57,300,000	38,000,000	-16,400,000	+38,000,000	-19,300,000
Appalachian highway system	100,000,000	80,000,000	100,000,000	80,000,000	-20,000,000	---	-20,000,000
Delaware River Basin Commission:							
Salaries and expenses	191,000	172,000	172,000	172,000	-19,000	---	---
Contribution to Delaware River Basin Commission	269,000	283,000	283,000	283,000	+14,000	---	---
Total, Delaware River Basin Commission	460,000	455,000	455,000	455,000	-5,000	---	---
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin:							
Contribution to Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin	68,000	---	70,000	70,000	+2,000	+70,000	---
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:							
Salaries and expenses	465,800,000	468,200,000	438,200,000	458,200,000	-7,600,000	-10,000,000	+20,000,000
Susquehanna River Basin Commission:							
Salaries and expenses	191,000	167,000	167,000	167,000	-24,000	---	---
Contribution to Susquehanna River Basin Commission	230,000	230,000	230,000	230,000	---	---	---
Total, Susquehanna River Basin Commission	421,000	397,000	397,000	397,000	-24,000	---	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1984 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1985—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1984 Appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)		
					1984 Appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Tennessee Valley Authority:							
Tennessee Valley Authority Fund	85,629,000	115,308,000	126,308,000	115,308,000	+29,679,000	---	-11,000,000
Total, title IV, Independent agencies:							
New budget (obligational) authority	709,478,000	664,360,000	725,430,000	694,130,000	-15,348,000	+29,770,000	-31,300,000
Grand total, all titles:							
New budget (obligational) authority	14,496,055,000	15,874,791,000	15,470,725,000	15,371,133,000	+875,078,000	-503,658,000	-99,592,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(91,802,000)	(106,000,000)	(110,500,000)	(108,500,000)	(+16,698,000)	(+2,500,000)	(-2,000,000)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(520,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(-20,000,000)	---	---
(Limitation on capital expenditures)	(78,000,000)	---	---	---	(-78,000,000)	---	---